Imprimatur.

Ex Ædib. Lamb.
Jan. 28. 1686.

Guil. Needham, R.R.
in Chriſto P. ac D.
D. Wilhelmo Ar-
chiep. Cant. à Sa-
cris.

Imprimatur.

Ex Ædib. Lamb.
Jan. 28. 1686.

Guil. Needham, R.R.
in Chriſto P. ac D.
D. Wilhelmo Ar-
chiep. Cant. à Sa-
cris.

Transubstantiation
NO
DOCTRINE
OF
The Primitive Fathers:
BEING A
DEFENCE
OF THE
Dublin Letter herein,
Againſt the
Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented,
Part 2. Cap. 3.

[John Patrick DD.] H&L

LONDON:
Printed for *Benjamin Tooke*, at the *Ship* in St. *Paul's Church-Yard.* 1687.

Tranſubſtantiation NO DOCTRINE OF THE Primitive Fathers, &c.

THE firſt page of this *Repreſenter* looks ſo big, that if words alone could fright us, he might hope his ſingle Sheet would do our buſineſs, and prove our Winding-ſheet. He begins thus: *The Papiſt Repreſented admits nothing to take place in his Creed, but upon ſuch ſtrong and convincing Motives, that none can accuſe him of Ignorance or Error, but thoſe who have their Judgments ſwallowed up by Prejudice, and whoſe Paſſion has over-run their Reaſon. The Inventions of men are with him but of little value; they may be the ſubjects of his opinion, but no concern of his Faith: This bids them Defiance, and embraces nothing but what is ſecurely founded on the Scripture, and the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers. Upon theſe ſolid and laſting Supports ſtand every Article of his Faith, and that of Tranſubſtantiation has nothing leſs than theſe to rely on.*

Would

Would any one, who has read what he here ſays, imagine that his very next words ſhould be theſe? *This has an undoubted claim to Antiquity.* Has he ſo ſoon forgotten the *ſolid Support* of Scripture, and that Tranſubſtantiation relies on *this* as well as on *Antiquity*, that we ſhould hear no more of Scripture from him, till he prepares for his Concluſion? and then indeed we have ſomewhat of St. *Paul* to little purpoſe, and his words are cited in an *ill Tranſlation*, and a *worſe Inſinuation*, as if they gave occaſion to object, *that Chriſt was no real and ſubſtantial man.* He knows that Scripture is the Rule of our Faith; that Chriſt and his Apoſtles are our Foundation. Had he began with their words, and ſhewn that the ſence of them is the ſence of his Church, our Faith had been ruined, and his ſecurely founded.

But juſt as naked *Adam* fled from the Voice of God, and hid himſelf among the Trees of the Garden; ſo he, being conſcious of the ſmall countenance which the *Word of God* affords them, runs into the *Wood of Fathers*, where we now find him, and in thoſe Thickets hopes to hide the ſhame of Tranſubſtantiation.

He cannot pretend that he was led thither by the Author of the Letter, whom he pretends to anſwer: for he gave him a remarkable occaſion (*pag.* 6.) whether he had greater inſight and skill in the Contents of that H. Book, than five Great men of his own Church, whom he there cites, had (and I'll name as many more to him when he pleaſes) three of which were Eminent *Cardinals*, who plainly told him, that they were ſo dim-ſighted, they were not able to diſcern, but that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine might remain in the Sacrament after Conſecration, notwithſtanding any words of Scripture, and that Tranſubſtantiation

ſtantiation could not be proved by it. Yet even this could not provoke him, to produce his *ſolid grounds* from thence.

But if he ſhould think fit hereafter, to try his skill this way, let me intreat him, when he has proved Tranſubſtantiation from Scripture, ſince he ſays he *embraces nothing but what is ſecurely founded on it*, to do the ſame for theſe following Articles of the *Trent Faith*, which is his, publiſhed by P. *Pius*, IV. and perhaps ſworn to by himſelf: *viz.*

That there are Seven Sacraments of the Goſpel, truly and properly ſo called, inſtituted by Chriſt, and neceſſary for the ſalvation of Mankind, (though not all neceſſary to every ſingle perſon) and that they confer Grace.

That in the Maſs is offered to God a true proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and Dead.

That under one kind onely whole and entire Chriſt and a true Sacrament is taken.

That there is a Purgatory, and that Souls detained there, are helped by the Suffrages of the Faithful.

That the Saints reigning with Chriſt are to be venerated and invoked.

That the Images of Chriſt, and the Ever-Virgin Mother of God, and of other Saints, are to be had and retained, and due honour and veneration to be beſtowed upon them.

That the Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Roman Church, is the Mother and Miſtreſs of all Churches.

And becauſe I preſume he believes his Churches practice *lawful* and *edifying*, to have the Ordinary and *Publick Prayers* and *reading of the Scriptures* in a Tongue which the Vulgar does not underſtand, and that he *embraces* that 4*th Rule* of the *Expurgatory Index*, made by order of the *Council of Trent*, That no man

man ſhould have or read the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, without a Licenſe, ſince it *occaſions more harm than good*, that he would be ſo kind as to inform us, Where the Scripture countenances theſe things, or repreſents it ſelf as ſo *dangerous a Book*, and that one muſt not obey a *plain Command of God*, without firſt *asking leave of men*. This need not coſt him much pains, ſince he has *Bellarmine* at hand for Scriptures, if he dare venture them abroad in our Tongue, and I dare ſay, all the Proofs from thence, may be eaſily compriſed in one Sheet more.

But, although we *build upon Scripture*, yet we do not *balk the Fathers*, eſpecially thoſe that are *truly Primitive*: we have that regard for them, that will not ſuffer us to deal with them as this *Repreſenter* does; who, as we ſhall ſee anon, cites them without judgment, ſets one Father againſt another, and the ſame Father againſt himſelf; who does not pretend ſo much as to reconcile them, and make them ſpeak the ſame thing, when they ſeemingly contradict one another; but he is for weighing the ſame man's Sayings in ſeveral Scales; or one Father is to be put in the Balance againſt another, to ſee which outweighs. All which, as he orders the matter, tends to nothing, but to make ſport for an Infidel, to give him a Pretence to be of any ſide he pleaſes, or rather no ſide, till the ſquabble is ended, and the Fathers are better agreed among themſelves.

But to come cloſer to the matter.

The Author of the Letter, (though the Repreſenter takes no notice of it) before he brings his Proofs from the Fathers, lays down the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* concerning Tranſubſtantiation, by giving in ſhort the ſubſtance of what the *Council of Trent* determined about it, that ſo all might ſee what it was he

he oppoſed. I'll do the ſame here, only ſet down the words at large out of the Council, to avoid all exception.

Concil. Trid. Seſſion 13. Cap. 6. *Concerning Tranſubſtantiation.*

Becauſe Chriſt our Redeemer ſaid, That what he offered under the Species of Bread, was truly his Body; therefore it was always in the Church of God believed, and the ſame this Holy Synod now again declares, that by the Conſecration of the Bread and Wine, there is made a converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Bread into the ſubſtance of the Body of Chriſt our Lord, and of the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the ſubſtance of his Blood; which converſion is conveniently and properly by the Holy Catholick Church called Tranſubſtantiation.

CANON I.

If any ſhall deny, That in the moſt Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, is contained truly, really and ſubſtantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and therefore whole Chriſt; but ſhall ſay, That he is in it onely, as in a Sign, or Figure, or Vertue, let him be Anathema.

CANON II.

If any ſhall affirm, That in the moſt Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, there remains the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, together with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and ſhall deny that wonderful and ſingular converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Bread into the Body,

and of the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the Blood, the Species onely of Bread and Wine remaining, which ſaid converſion the Catholick Church moſt fitly calls Tranſubſtantiation, let him be Anathema.

CANON III.

If any ſhall deny, That in the Venerable Sacrament of the Euchariſt, under either Species, and under every ſingle part of each Species, after ſeparation made, whole Chriſt is contained, let him be Anathema.

Now this Doctrine, which the Council ſays was always believed in the Church of God, and pronounces an Anathema againſt all that do not believe it, the *Dublin Letter* proceeds to ſhew, was not the Belief of the Primitive Fathers, and begins with the words of *Dionyſius*.

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
The firſt I ſhall name is *Dionyſius Areopagita*, who was St. *Paul*'s Diſciple, and lived about the firſt Century, who, diſtinguiſhing between the ſubſtantial Signs and Chriſt ſignified by them, expreſſes himſelf thus: (*Eccleſ. Hier. c.* 3.) *By thoſe reverend Signs and Symbols Chriſt is ſignified, and the faithful made partakers of him.*	*Dionyſius*, in the ſame Chapter, prays thus to Chriſt in the Sacrament: *O moſt Divine and Holy Sacrifice, open thoſe myſtical and ſignifying Vails wherewith thou art covered, ſhew thy ſelf clearly unto us, and repleniſh our ſpiritual eyes with thy ſingular and revealed brightneſs.*

DEFENCE.

DEFENCE.

The Letter ſays, That *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, St. *Paul*'s Diſciple, living about the firſt Century, was the Author of the words he cites.

To ſhew that I intend not to juſtifie the miſtakes of our own men, I freely acknowledge this to be one. For it has been ſufficiently demonſtrated by learned men on both ſides, that the Books that go under this name are ſpurious, unknown to the World till five hundred years after Chriſt; his Teſtimonies firſt produced by the *Severian* Hereticks, in a Conference with the *Catholicks* at *Conſtantinople* *, and by them refuſed as not genuine: and indeed in moſt places the very ſtile of this Author is ſo far from being plain, and Apoſtolical, that it is vainly ſwelling and pompous, and his ſenſe in ſome places unintelligible. * Concil. Tom. 4.

But yet the *Repreſenter* will gain nothing by this acknowledgment; for though we ſtand in no need of his Authority, yet what the *Letter* cites out of him is very pertinent. That *by the Signs and Symbols* (in the Sacrament) *Chriſt is ſignified, and the faithful made partakers of him.* To which, if you add what he ſays in the Chapter before, That *ſenſible Sacraments are the Images of things intelligible*; and what *Maximus* his Interpreter ſays, (on the third Chapter) That *theſe things are Symbols and not the Truth*, they will need no farther diſcourſe, to prove, that they agree with *our* ſenſe, but cannot with *theirs*, for, according to that, the *Signs* and *Symbols* muſt ceaſe to be, to make way for the *preſence of the Truth.*

What the *Repreſenter* puts againſt this in the other Scale, is what he prays to Chriſt in the Sacrament for,

in the same Chapter, *O most Divine and Holy Sacrifice, open*, &c. as above.

Till he is pleased to tell us wherein consists the weightiness of the words he cites, I shall onely say this at present, (without questioning why he translates ἱερὰ τελετὴ, holy *Sacrifice*) That I know but few *Protestants* that I think would refuse to joyn in this Prayer to Christ now in Heaven, that, since we see all things now *through a Glass darkly*, he would shew himself more cleerly to us, especially with relation to the future state and coming of our Lord, when, as another Father † speaks, *we shall no more need the Symbols of his body, the body it self appearing, and therefore the Apostle says*, till he come.

† *Theodoret in* 1 Cor. 11.

But the *Representer* says, that *Dionysius prays thus to Christ in the Sacrament*, and I imagine he may lay the stress there. But since it is the current Doctrine ‖ in the *Roman* Church, that Christ exists in the Eucharist after the manner of one that *is Dead*, neither seeing nor hearing, nor exercising any vital act, without a Miracle, nor any operation of external or internal sense; it seems not so natural to pray to him thus *in the Sacrament, to shew himself cleerly to us, and open the mystical veils*; for *naturally* they all agree, that none can see Christ there, and many say, that it is not to be done by the *absolute power of God*, onely *Alensis* thinks indeed, that by a special Priviledge, the blessed Virgin could see Christ's Body there.

‖ *Gordon* Jes. controv. 8. c. 4. n. 19. *Suarez* in 3 part, disp. 53. qu. 76. art. 7. sec. 3. *Vasquez* in 3 part, qu. 76. disp. 191. art. 7. c. 3. *Bretanus* de Sacram. c. 19. qu. 4, 5. and abundance more.

Dublin

Dublin Letter.

Juſtin Martyr (Apol. 2. pag. 98. Pariſ. 1636.) who lived about the year 150. ſays expreſly, *That our bloud and fleſh are nouriſhed by the converſion of that food which we receive in the Euchariſt.*

Repreſenter.

Juſtin Martyr. This place of this Father is thus at length: *For we do not receive this as common Bread, or common Drink; but as by the Word of God, Jeſus Chriſt our Redeemer being made man, had both fleſh and bloud for our ſalvation: So alſo we are taught that this food, by which our bloud and fleſh are by a change nouriſhed, being conſecrated by the Prayer of the Word, is the fleſh and bloud of Chriſt Jeſus himſelf incarnate.*

DEFENCE.

The words of *Juſtine M.* which the Letter cites, are very remarkable, ſince the Converſion he ſpeaks of, is as different as may be from what Tranſubſtantiation ſuppoſes, *viz.* a change of the Elements into the ſubſtance of *Chriſt's Body*; and *Juſtine* makes the change into the *Subſtance of our Bodies*, becauſe they nouriſh them. The *Repreſenter* has nothing to balance this withal, but the ſetting down this Fathers words at length. What he thinks to gain by giving us the whole Paragraph of *Juſtine*, I know not; but I heartily thank him for it, ſince it ſerves to make two or three plain diſcoveries of moment. As, 1. That the very phraſe of not receiving the Sacrament *as common Bread*, ſuppoſes that there is Bread in ſubſtance ſtill remaining there. For if I ſhould ſay of the *Kings broad Seal* annexed

nexed to a Writing, Do not look upon it as *common Wax*, it would be ridiculous to imagine by this Speech, that the ſubſtance of *Wax* vaniſhed as ſoon as the *Seal* came upon it. Thus when St. *Cyril Hieroſ.* * cautions men not to approach to the Laver of Baptiſm, as to ſimple or common Water, he never dream'd that the Water was tranſubſtantiated, though he ſays that *Spiritual Grace is given with it.* And in another place, † where he ſays, *As the Bread of the Euchariſt, after the invocation of the H. Ghoſt, is not bare Bread, but the Body of Chriſt; ſo this H. Oyntment is no more bare or common Oyntment, after invocation, but χάρισμα χριστοῦ, the Gift of Chriſt and the H. Ghoſt, effective of the preſence of his Divinity.* The Parallel would not well hold, if in both caſes (as well as confeſſedly in one) the ſubſtance of them did not remain, notwithſtanding the change by Invocation. 2. That *Juſtin Martyr*'s opinion was, that the conſecration of the Elements was made by Prayer, (and generally the Fathers follow him herein) and not by pronouncing theſe words, *This is my Body*, (which is the Opinion of the Roman Church) ſince thoſe words are no Prayer. 3. That the food *ſo conſecrated* nouriſhes our fleſh and bloud: For he does not ſay of it, conſidered as unconſecrated, that it nouriſhes; but he affirms this of the εὐχαριστηθὲν τροφὴ, *the food made to be the Euchariſt*, (which it is not before conſecration) that our fleſh and bloud are nouriſhed thereby: And it is the very ſame that St. *Irenæus* ‖ ſaid after him, *That our Fleſh is nouriſhed by the Body and Bloud of Chriſt.* And in *Tertullian*'s time it is plain by his words, * that they thought that receiving the Euchacharist, *broke the Faſt* of their *Station-days*, and therefore rather than do ſo, forbore to receive the Sacrament on thoſe days: and he does not reprove them for

* Catech. 3. p. 53. Pariſ. 1608.

† Catech. Myſtag. 3. p. 525.

Εὐχαριστηθὲν τροφὴ ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκας χρ. μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν.

‖ Lib. 4. adv. hæreſ. c. 34.

* De Oratione c. 14. ad finem.

for thinking ſo, but for that forbearance; and he finds an Expedient to reſerve the Euchariſt they had received at Church, and to take it after the Station or Faſt was ended: which had been a ridiculous fancy, if they had been of the mind of the preſent Roman Church; but to them that believed that what they received was ſubſtantially Bread and Wine, and as ſuch capable of refreſhing their Bodies, and giving them nouriſhment, it was an objection, as not agreeable to their Faſts.

Dublin Letter.

The next is *Tertullian*, about the year 200, his words are theſe: (*Adv. Marcion.* lib. 4. cap. 40.) *Chriſt taking the Bread and diſtributing it to his Diſciples, made it his Body, ſaying*, This is my Body; *that is to ſay*, a figure of my Body.

Repreſenter.

Tertullian. Chriſt taking the Bread, &c. *made it his Body*, &c. which means, That he made that to be his Body, which had been a Figure of his Body in the Old Law, to wit, the Bread; as it is evident from the Context, and is prov'd at large by *Perron*, who ſhews the deſign of *Tertullian* in that diſcourſe againſt *Marcion* to be, that Chriſt came to fulfil all Types and Figures of the Old Law: and ſo that he made the Bread to be his Body, which in the Old Law had been onely a Figure of it. The ſame *Tertullian*, l. de Reſur. carn. c. 8. ſays thus: *Our fleſh feeds on the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, that our Soul may be filled with God.*

DE-

DEFENCE.

The *Repreſenter* here undertakes to explain *Tertullian*'s words, brought by the Letter, and oppoſes another Teſtimony of *Tertullian* againſt it.

His explication, which I have ſet down, is indeed a very pretty Conceit. *Tertullian*, I think, ſays plainly enough, That Chriſt made Bread his Body, when he made it (in the Sacrament) to be the Figure of his Body: No, ſays the *Repreſenter*; it means, he made it his true Body without a Figure, though it had been a Figure of it before: and he may make what he pleaſes of any thing by ſuch interpretations. But ſince he refers us for this to Cardinal *Perron*, without giving us his words; I ſhall alſo, to avoid prolixity, refer him to a Biſhop of our own, * who has fully confuted him. Onely let me adviſe him to reflect a little, whether this woful ſhift will fit other places of *Tertullian*, which ſay the ſame: As when he ſays, † *Neither did Chriſt reject Bread, by which he repreſents his own Body*, (though I know their exceptions about the word *repreſents*:) And in another Book againſt *Marcion*, ‖ *Chriſt calls Bread his Body, that you may from thence underſtand that he gave the figure of his Body to the Bread.* Let him try how this interpretation will agree to that of St. *Jerome* *: *After the typical Paſſover was over, Chriſt paſſes to the true Paſchal Sacrament, that juſt as* Melchiſedeck *prefiguring him had done, when he offered Bread and Wine, he alſo might repreſent the Truth of his Body and Bloud.* He may alſo do well to reconcile it with that of *Bede*: † *Our Redeemer is therefore ſaid to be a Prieſt after the Order of* Melchiſedeck, *becauſe taking away the Legal Victims, he appointed the ſame kind of Sacrifice*

* Biſh. *Taylor* R. Preſence, Sec. 12. Nu. 19.

† L. 1. adv. *Marcion*, c. 14.

‖ L. 3. c. 19.

* Com. in *Mat.* c. 26.

† Homil. in Vigil. S. Joh. Bapt.

crifice (*viz.* Bread and Wine which was *Melchiſedeck's*) *to be offered in the New Teſtament, to become the Myſtery of his Body and Bloud.* Which very interpretation St. *Chryſoſtom* gave before him || upon thoſe words, *Thou art a Prieſt for ever after the Order of* Melchiſedeck; he asks, *Why did he ſay, after the Order of Melchiſedeck? becauſe he alſo offered Bread and Wine to Abraham.* Which ſuppoſes that what he gave was Bread and Wine in ſubſtance, and not quite another thing in ſubſtance, as Fleſh and Bloud is.

|| Comm. in Pſal. 110.

As for the teſtimony of *Tertullian*, which the *Repreſenter* oppoſes againſt us, above cited, the Reply is very eaſie to it, *viz.* That ſince *Tertullian* has told us ſo often, that Chriſt *called the Bread his Body*, it need be no wonder if he himſelf for once calls the *Sign* by that name, and means by the Body and Bloud of Chriſt which our fleſh feeds on, thoſe Elements in the Euchariſt, which as *Juſtin Martyr* told us before, is *food that by a change nouriſhes our fleſh and bloud.* And I believe our *Repreſenter*, as daring as he is, would hardly aſſert, that Chriſt's Body and Bloud are the food of our fleſh without a figure, and therefore in Conſcience ſhould not have objected this Teſtimony, without explaining its meaning.

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
And elſewhere *Tertullian* (*lib. de anima. p.*319.) arguing againſt the *Sceptick* who denied the certainty of ſence, uſeth this Argument: *That if we queſtion our ſences, we may doubt*	*Chryſoſt.* Homil. 83. in Mat. *Let us give credit to God every-where, and not contradict him, although what he ſays ſeems contrary to our apprehenſions and our eyes: Let his ſaying*

doubt whether our bleſſed Saviour was not deceived in what he heard, and ſaw, and touched: He might, ſays he, *be deceived in the voice from Heaven, in the ſmell of the Oyntment with which he was anointed againſt his burial, and in the taſte of the Wine which he conſecrated in remembrance of his bloud.* So that it ſeems we are to truſt our ſenſes even in the matter of the Sacrament; and if that be true, the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is certainly falſe.

maſter our Underſtanding, and our Eyes. And thus let us behave our ſelves in the Myſteries, not onely looking upon what is before us, but holding faſt his words: For his words cannot deceive, but our ſenſe may be eaſily miſtaken; his words cannot be untrue, but our ſenſe is very often deceived. Since therefore he has ſaid, This is my Body, *let us be convinc'd and believe, and behold it with the eyes of our underſtanding.*

Cyril Hieroſ. Catech. c. 4. *Do not therefore look on it as meer Bread onely, or bare Wine; for as God himſelf has ſaid, 'tis the Body and Bloud of Chriſt: Notwithſtanding therefore the information of Senſe, let Faith confirm thee, and do not judge of the thing by the Taſte; but rather take it for moſt certain by Faith, without the leaſt doubting that his Body and Bloud are given thee.*

DEFENCE.

I ſuppoſe the *Repreſenter* may imagine that his firſt Citation out of St. *Chryſoſtom,* is calculated only for the *Euchariſt,* and that he intends we ſhould not believe our Senſes in what they perceive there, concerning the Bread and Wine. But for his illumination, he may pleaſe to underſtand, that St. *Chryſoſtom* ſays the ſame of

of *Baptiſm*: * *Let us believe the Affirmation of God, for it is more certain than our Sight; for our Sight often fails, but it's impoſſible that ſhould fail.* Yet for all this calling upon us to disbelieve our Senſes, there is no Tranſubſtantiation in Baptiſm. Neither does that Great man intend that we ſhould ſimply disbelieve what we ſee, but that we ought to believe further than we can ſee. For as he excellently explains himſelf † in the caſe of *Baptiſm*: *A*, ſays he, *and an Infidel are diverſly affected; he thinks it to be ſimple water, but I look not barely upon what is ſeen, but upon the cleanſing of the Soul by the Spirit.*

* Homil. 24. in Johan.

† Hom. 7. in 1 Corinth.

To open the Repreſenters eyes by another inſtance: Suppoſe one ſhould confidently affix as abſurd a ſence to the words of St. *Paul*, (1 Cor. 10. 4.) *of the ſpiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt*; as they do upon Chriſt's words, *This is my Body*; and ſhould aſſert, that the Rock in the Wilderneſs was no *material Rock*, becauſe it's ſaid to be a *ſpiritual one*; and that it was a *travelling Rock*, becauſe the Text ſays expreſly, *it followed them*; and that it was changed into *Chriſt himſelf*, ſince the words are plain, *that Rock was Chriſt*; he does not ſay it ſignified Chriſt: and ſhould further urge the fore-cited words of St. *Chryſoſtom*, *That we muſt give credit to God, though what he ſays ſeems contrary to our apprehenſions and eyes*, &c. I will undertake, that whatſoever Anſwer the *Repreſenter* ſhall give, to undeceive ſuch a perſon, I will apply the ſame as fairly to confute his ſence of Tranſubſtantiation in the Euchariſt.

As for the ſecond Teſtimony out of St. *Cyril*, which he alſo confronts, *Do not therefore look on it as meer Bread*, &c. I anſwer, We agree to every word he has cited: We look on this as a Sacrament, and

therefore look beyond the bare Bread and Wine: We believe what God has ſaid, that its *the Body and Bloud of Chriſt*, in the ſame ſence that the Repreſenter believes that *Baptiſm* is *Regeneration:* We judge not of the hidden ſence of the myſtery by our Taſte: We have a moſt certain Faith that Chriſt's Body and Bloud are given in the Euchariſt; and therefore we pray, that *we receiving theſe Creatures of Bread and Wine according to our Saviours Inſtitution, may be Partakers of his moſt bleſſed Body and Bloud.* But now can any one tell me how this of *Cyril* proves Tranſubſtantiation? His very firſt words, if that be true, are wholly abſurd and impertinent, to bid men not look on it as *meer* Bread and Wine, when there is neither Bread nor Wine to be look'd upon at all.

Dublin Letter.

Origen, who liv'd about *Tertullian*'s time, calls the Bread and the Chalice (*in Dial. adv. Marcion*) *The Images of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt:* and ſo are not the very Natural Body and Bloud of Chriſt.

And in another place (in *Mat.* c. 15.) he ſays, *That which is conſecrated by Gods Word and Prayer, as to the matter of it, goeth into the belly, and is voided into the draught.*

Repreſenter.

Origen, Hom. 5. in Joh. Evang. When you receive the holy Food and that incorruptible Banquet, when you enjoy the Bread of Life and Cup, you eat and drink the Body and Bloud of our Lord, then our Lord enters under your Roof: Do you therefore humble your ſelf, and imitating the Centurion, ſay, Lord, I am not worthy thou ſhouldeſt enter under my Roof: *for where he enters unworthily, there he enters to the Judgment of the Receiver.*

DE-

DEFENCE.

Though there is good reaſon to queſtion the Homily here cited by the *Repreſenter*, and to ſuſpect it not to be *Origen*'s, ſince it comes in the company of thoſe which *Bellarmine* himſelf ſays are undoubtedly none of his: Yet we'll allow him to make the beſt of it; and, after all, it will be found too light to counterbalance thoſe which the *Letter* gives us out of *Origen*, eſpecially if we ſet down what goes before the words which the *Repreſenter* cites, which are theſe, *The Lord*, ſays he, *enters under the Roof of Believers, by a two-fold figure or manner. For now when the Holy Prelates, and acceptable to God, enter under thy Roof, then the Lord enters there by them, and do thou eſteem them, as if thou receiveds't the Lord himſelf. Another way is, when you receive the Holy Food*, &c. as above. Is it not plain enough, that both theſe ways of entrance, he mentions, are figurative? both by the Biſhops, who are not his very perſon, but onely repreſent him; and by the Sacrament, which is his *Typical and Symbolical*, but not his *Natural* and *Proper Body?* and when it is thus underſtood, he may be ſaid to enter under the Roof of unworthy receivers.

But ſtill, to refute further the *Repreſenter's* ſence, and to ſhew what was *Origen*'s in this matter, I will alſo take notice of what follows a few lines after the words laſt cited in the *Dublin Letter*; thus he proceeds, * *Many things might be ſaid alſo concerning the Word it ſelf, which was made fleſh, and is the true meat, which whoſoever eats, ſhall certainly live for ever, which no bad man can eat: for if it were poſſible for him that ſtill continues wicked, to eat the Word made fleſh, ſeeing it is the Living*

* Comm. in Matth. 15.

Living Word and Bread, it would not have been written, that whoſoever eateth of this Bread ſhall live for ever.

† Tract. 3. in Matth. *Origen* alſo in another place has theſe words, † *Good men indeed eat of the Living Bread that came down from Heaven, but the wicked eat of a Dead Bread, which is Death.*

|| Hom. 7. in Levit. And in another Homily || he ſays, *That eating Chriſt's fleſh, and drinking his blood, according to the Letter, is a Letter that kills.* Thus I think we have more than turned the Scale on our ſide, by what has been alledged out of him.

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
What can be more plain, than what St. *Ambroſe* ſays on this occaſion, (*de Sacram. l.* 4. *c.* 4.) *The Bread and Wine are what they were, and yet are changed into another thing.*	St. *Ambroſe*, *De Myſt. init. c.* 9. *How many Examples do we produce to prove, that this is not what Nature fram'd, but what the Benediction has conſecrated; and that the Power of Benediction, is greater than the Power of Nature, becauſe, by Benediction, Nature it ſelf is chang'd?* Moſes *held a Rod in his hand, he caſt it from him, and it became a Serpent.* —— *The Rivers afforded no Drink; at the Prayers of the Prophet they ran no longer Blood, but the Nature of Waters returned.* —— *Now if Bleſſings given by men were of ſo great efficacy, as to change the Nature of things, what ſhall we ſay of the Divine Conſecration, where the very words of Chriſt our Saviour are operative? For this Sacrament which thou receiveſt, is made by the words of Chriſt. And if the words of* Elias *were ſo powerful, as to draw fire from Heaven, ſhall not the words of Chriſt be powerful enough, to change the Nature of things? Thou haſt*

haſt read of the Creation of the World, that God ſpake, and the things were made, he commanded and they received a being. If therefore Chriſt, by his Word, was able to make ſomething of nothing, ſhall he not be thought able to change one thing into another? For it is no leſs a work to give a Nature or Being to things, than to change them from one Nature to another.—— 'Twas above the order of Nature for a Virgin to conceive, and this Body which we make in the Sacrament, is that which was born of the Virgin. Why do you require here the order of Nature in the Body of Chriſt, when, as above all Nature, Chriſt was born of a Virgin?

DEFENCE.

Here I firſt of all complain, that the *Repreſenter* has left out ſome very ſignificant Expreſſions, that ſerve to clear the whole. Theſe, for example, are left out, (after the laſt breaking off) *But how long do we uſe Arguments? Let us make uſe of his own Examples, and by that of the Incarnation, aſſert the Truth of the Myſtery.* And after his concluding words, *Chriſt was born of a Virgin,* it follows thus in St. *Ambroſe, It was the true fleſh of Chriſt that was crucified, that was buried; therefore it* (the Bread) *is truly the Sacrament of that Fleſh. Our Lord Jeſus himſelf ſpeaks it aloud,* This is my Body. *Before the Benediction of the Celeſtial Words, another Species is named* (he means, it is Bread) *after Conſecration, the body of Chriſt is ſignified. He ſays,* His Blood; *before Conſecration it is called another thing,* (i. e. Wine) *after Conſecration it is called Blood. And thou ſayeſt, Amen, this is true: that which thy mouth ſpeaks, let thy mind inwardly confeſs; what the word ſounds, let thy affections have a ſenſe of.*

I com-

I complain moreover, That he has ill tranſlated, and alſo added ſome words to the Text of St. *Ambroſe*, to pervert his ſence. *Ut Species mutet Elementorum*, he tranſlates, *to change the Nature of things*, inſtead of, *to change the Species of the Elements*, that ſo we might not take notice, that the word *Species* is not uſed by St. *Ambroſe*, as it is by the *Council of Trent*, to ſignifie, *Accidents without a Subject*, for ſo none of the *Fathers* ever uſe it: nor think of their Doctrine, *concerning Accidents remaining the ſame*, when the *Subſtance is changed*, which he never dreamt of.

As for the Phraſe, *The Body which we make*, (the *Repreſenter* adds, *in the Sacrament*) *is that which was born of the Virgin*; that muſt mean the Typical Body, or the *Sacrament* of that Body which was born of the Virgin; for the *Body it ſelf* cannot be made to be, for it was made before of the Virgin, and never ceaſed to be; but that which is thus made, was not, before it was made. St. *Ambroſe* himſelf ſo explains it, in the words before, *Sacramentum illud quod accipis, Sermone Chriſti Conficitur. The Sacrament thou takeſt, is made by the Word of Chriſt.* This which I have noted, might ſuffice to explain the Expreſſions St. *Ambroſe* uſes, concerning Chriſt's Body. But the *Repreſenter* (as well as the reſt of their Authors) intends a mighty Objection againſt us, in the places he has cited, taken from the Examples St. *Ambroſe* brings, and elegantly expreſſes, concerning the Creation of the World, the Incarnation of our Saviour, and other Miracles of Almighty Power making ſtrange changes in the Nature of things; which they think is too much to be ſaid, of any other Changes in the Sacrament, ſave onely ſuch as are made in the way of Tranſubſtantiation. But they will find themſelves extremely miſtaken: (that I may anſwer this Pretence

in

in ſhort, which they ſo much glory in) For as in the fore-named Examples, things were done and changes wrought, beſides the order of Nature and above it; ſo the Fathers tell us things are done in the Sacraments. The very making Elements *common* before, to become *Sanctified ones*, they acknowledge is onely from *Divine Inſtitution*; but then the making them to be Inſtruments of our Sanctification, of our Union to, and Communion with our Saviour, are Effects of a Divine Vertue, and a Work of Almighty and Supernatural Power. But that which utterly confounds the Objection is, they do not make all theſe great things to be wrought onely in the *Euchariſt*, but in *Baptiſm* alſo, where the *Repreſenter* will acknowledge there is no Tranſubſtantiation. It is a Rule that *Cyril of Jeruſalem* gives *, *Whatſoever the Holy Ghoſt touches is ſanctified and changed.* And thus the other *Cyril* ſays †, that *the ſenſible Water* (in Baptiſm) *by the efficacy of the Spirit is tranſ elemented* (ἀναστοιχειῶται) *into a kind of Divine and unſpeakable Vertue.* And ſo St. *Chryſoſtom* ſays ‖, *It is not the Angel that moves the Water, but the Lord of Angels that worketh all things.* And in another place *, *Great is the Vertue of Baptiſm, thoſe that partake of this Gift, of one kind of perſons it makes another, nor ſuffers men to be men; for,* as it follows, *they are made Angels inſtead of men,* (yet without Tranſubſtantiation.) And ſo *Leo Mag.* † *He that is received by Chriſt, and receives Chriſt, is not the ſame after Baptiſm that he was before it, but the Body of the Regenerate, is made the fleſh of the crucified* (Jeſus;) *this is a Change wrought by the right hand of the Moſt High,* &c.

* Catech. Myſt. 5.
† Cyril Alex. in Joh. 3. 5.
‖ Hom. 35. in Johan.
* Hom. 23. in Act.
† De paſſ. Dom. Ser. 14.

St. *Ambroſe* himſelf, at the end of that Chapter, (whence the *Repreſenter* has fetch'd his Teſtimonies

above cited) ſpeaking of our being regenerate and born again, ſays thus; *I acknowledge no uſe of Nature. There is no order of Nature here, where there is the excellency of Grace*—— And he concludes thus, *Si ergo ſuperveniens ſpiritus ſanctus in Virginem, conceptionem operatus eſt & generationis munus implevit, non utiq; dubitandum eſt, quod ſuperveniens in fontem, vel ſuper eum qui Baptiſmum conſequitur, veritatem regenerationis cooperetur.* The ſenſe of which is this, That no queſtion is to be made, but that the Holy Ghoſt that overſhadowed the bleſſed Virgin, &c. *lighting down upon the Font, or upon him that is baptized in it, does produce the truth of Regeneration,* as he did that of Chriſt's Incarnation.

Let me onely add further (to be ſtill ingenuous in my acknowledgments) concerning the Teſtimony, cited by the *Dublin Letter*, out of the Book *de Sacramentis*, for St. *Ambroſe's*, That although I do not for very good Reaſons agree with him, that St. *Ambroſe* was the Author of thoſe Books; yet ſince the *Repreſenter* I preſume (as the reſt of his Church) thinks he was, he was bound, when the Teſtimony is ſo remarkable, that there can ſcarce be one fuller againſt Tranſubſtantiation, than this ſaying, [*That things may ſtill be what they were, and yet be changed into another thing*] He, I ſay, was bound, not to ſet, as he does, other Teſtimonies onely of St. *Ambroſe* againſt it, as if he intended to make him quarrel with himſelf, and ſo to make every thing he ſays in this matter to ſignifie nothing at all; but to reconcile him with himſelf: which yet I never expect to ſee him do, when I ſee how this ſaying troubled *Lanfranck* * ſo much, that he abſolutely denies that *Ambroſe* has any ſuch ſaying in his Book of Sacraments, or any other of his Books: and

* De Sacr. Euch. Lovan. ap. M. Rotarium, 1551. fol. 8.

and *Guitmund* and *Algerus* † who acknowledge, that he has ſuch words, yet are ſo ſadly put to it, to explain them, that they had better have ſaid nothing at all, than a great deal to little purpoſe.

† Guitmund de Sacr. l. 3. ib. f. 68. Algerus de Sacr. l. 1. c. 7. ib.

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
Theodoret, Dial. 1. & 2. *Chriſt honoured the Symbols and the Signs with the Title of his Body and Blood, not changing the Nature, but to Nature adding Grace. For neither do the myſtical Signs recede from their Nature, for they abide in their proper ſubſtance, figure, and form, and may be ſeen and toucht.*	*Theodoret*, immediately after the words cited in the adverſe Column, goes on in theſe words: *The myſtical Signs are underſtood to be that which they are made, and they are believ'd and* ador'd, *as being thoſe very things which they are believ'd.* And in his *Comment. in Epiſ. ad Cor.* he ſays, *That Chriſt gave his precious Body and Blood, not onely to the eleven Apoſtles, but alſo to the Traitor* Judas. And, *That they contemn and affront Chriſt, who take his moſt ſacred Body into their unclean hands, and receive it within their polluted mouths.*

DEFENCE.

Since the *Repreſenter* is for going on with *Theodoret*'s teſtimony, cited by the *Letter*, (though to little purpoſe, as we ſhall preſently ſee) I alſo will go on with *Theodoret*'s words, as they follow immediately after what he cites, which are theſe: *Compare now the Image with the Archetype*, or Original, (*viz.* what he calls

before δεσποτικὸν σῶμα, *the Lord's body*, and τὸ ὄντως σῶμα, *his body truly and properly ſo called*, of which the Myſteries are ἀντίτυπα, *Antitypes*) *and you will ſee the likeneſs; for the Type ought to be like to the Truth*, (and therefore not the ſame thing) *For that Body retains its former form, figure and circumſcription*, (περιγραφὴν) *and to ſay all at once, the ſubſtance* or eſſence *of a body, onely after its Reſurrection, it's become immortal and uncorruptible, and is ſeated at God's right hand, and adored by every creature, as being called the Body of the Lord of Nature.*

And now if he imagines, what he has ſet down out of *Theodoret*, againſt all this, will bring down the Scale on his ſide, I can onely admire his Confidence. Does he think it enough *to tell us from him, That the myſtical Signs are underſtood and believ'd to be that which they are made?* How does that contradict us, who believe and conceive of them ſo too? We agree, that they are made the Body and Blood of Chriſt; but the Queſtion is, in what ſenſe they are made ſo? We ſay in the way of *Repreſentation and Efficacy*, or, as *Theodoret* ſays, *not by any change of Subſtance and Nature*, but by *the Addition of Grace*. But now all the addition of Grace and Efficacy in the World will not ſerve his turn, without a mutation and change of the Subſtance of the Elements, and leaving nothing in the room but Species (as they phraſe it) and Accidents without a Subject, which onely is Tranſubſtantiation.

But *Theodoret* ſays, *they are believ'd and ador'd too*, as being thoſe very things which they are believed; which word, [*ador'd*] the *Repreſenter* puts in a different Character, that we may know he lays a great deal of ſtreſs there, meaning that ſuch an *Adoration* is due to the Myſteries, as is *due to God*. But is he certain

certain that προσκυνεῖν & προσκυνητὸς, (which are the words uſed by *Theodoret*) are never to be tranſlated otherwiſe than *to adore*, or *adorable*, as ſignifying *with Divine Worſhip?* Methinks *Theodoret* himſelf may help to undeceive him, who ſays, * *It is extream madneſs to adore* (προσκυνεῖν) *that which is eaten.* Therefore when he calls the Sacrament, which we know is eaten, τύπον προσκυνητὸν, (in his third Dialogue) he cannot mean that it is a *Type adorable* as God is, but *venerable* with a lower Honour; unleſs you will make him to contradict himſelf. And ſo muſt twenty other paſſages be underſtood, (as a learned man † has abundantly ſhewn) concerning *Temples, Holy Veſſels, Reliques, Images, the Manger where Chriſt lay*, &c. Concerning all which, *Theodoret*'s word is uſed indeed, but muſt be underſtood, as the ſubject matter requires it, onely of *Honorary* and not of the *Higheſt Worſhip of Adoration.* And thus when *Tertullian* ſays‖, *I adore the fulneſs of the Scriptures*; he meant to ſignifie the great *veneration* he had for that Holy Book and the Contents of it, but nothing more.

* In Geneſ. qu. 55.

† *Albertinus* de Euchariſt. p. 822.

‖ Adv. Hermog.

The next words he objects out of *Theodoret* ſay, *That Chriſt gave his pretious Body and Bloud not onely to the eleven Apoſtles, but alſo to the Traytor Judas.* We all know from the Scriptures, that what Chriſt gave to the Apoſtles was *Bread and Wine*; and we know that he honoured theſe Elements with the name of his *Body and Bloud*, and intended that in the due receiving of them, they ſhould be partakers of his Body and Bloud: as St. *Paul* tells us, (1 *Cor.* 10.) *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the bloud of Chriſt? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt?*

And St. *Auſtin* tells us*, *That a man may receive the Sacra-*

* In 1 Joh. tract. 7.

Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and be an evil man: for of ſuch it is ſaid, He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himſelf.

† De Civ. Dei, l. 21. c. 25. But then the ſame Father † elſewhere ſpeaking of evil men, ſays, *Such cannot be ſaid to eat Chriſt's Body,* (ſave onely his typical Body in the Sacrament) *becauſe they are not to be reckoned among Chriſt's Members.*

Laſtly, When *Theodoret* ſays, That *they contemn and affront Chriſt, who take his moſt ſacred Body into their unclean hands,* &c. he might well ſay ſo, and yet not believe Tranſubſtantiation. For underſtanding it of his *Repreſentative Body* in the Sacrament, ſuch would affront him, who received it with polluted hands, and into a polluted mouth: for it is a known Rule of St. *Jerom's* ‖, *When the Sacraments are violated, he is injured whoſe Sacraments they are.*

‖ In 1 cap. Malac.

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
Euſebius (Dem. Evan. l. 8.) ſays, *Chriſt gave his Diſciples the Symbols of Divine Oeconomy, commanding the Image and Type of his Body to be made.*	*Euſebius, lib.* 1. *Dem. Evang. c.* 10. Being now preferr'd to a more excellent Sacrifice and Office, than that was of the Old Law, we think it unreaſonable any more to fall back to thoſe firſt and weak Elements, which contain certain Signs and Figures, but not the Truth it ſelf.

Id. as cited by St. *Jo. Damaſcen. Many ſinners being Prieſts, do offer Sacrifice; neither does God deny his aſſiſtance, but by the Holy Ghoſt conſecrates the propoſed Gifts: and the Bread indeed is made the pretious Body of our Lord, and the Cup his pretious Bloud.*

DE-

DEFENCE.

If the *Repreſenter* by the words of his firſt Teſtimony, would have us believe, that thoſe *under the Law* had Signs and Figures which contained nothing of Chriſt *the Truth* in them, it would not agree with St. *Paul*'s words, 1 *Cor.* 10. that *the Fathers did eat the ſame ſpiritual meat, and drank the ſame ſpiritual drink: for they drank of the Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt.* They ſaw indeed thoſe things weakly and obſcurely, that are now more clearly and fully manifeſted to us; they diſcerned that afar off, which is preſent to us. But till the *Repreſenter* tells us more of his mind, I ſhall content my ſelf with what *Fulgentius* ſays *, (which are a good Comment upon the words of *Euſebius*) *In thoſe Sacrifices* (of the Old Law) *was figuratively ſignified what ſhould be given to us; but in the Sacrifice* (*viz.* the Euchariſt) *what is actually beſtowed on us, is evidently ſhewn.*

* De fide ad Petrum, c. 9.

As for thoſe words of *Euſebius*, which he ſays are cited by *Jo. Damaſcen*, ſince he does not tell us where to find them in him, I am apt to ſuſpect the *Repreſenter* never ſaw them there. But grant they were there, they could not ſerve his purpoſe more than ours, unleſs there be no other way how the Bread ſhould be made Chriſt's Body, and the Cup his pretious Bloud, but onely by Tranſubſtantiation; which it will be long enough before he proves.

Dublin.

Dublin Letter.

St. *Gr. Nazianzen* (Orat. 2. in Paſch.) ſpeaks ſo expreſly in this matter, as if he had purpoſely undertaken to confute the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. *Now*, ſays he, *we ſhall be partakers of the Paſchal Supper, but ſtill in a Figure, though more clear than in the Old Law: for the Legal Paſſover (I will not be afraid to ſpeak it) was a more obſcure Figure of a Figure.*

Repreſenter.

St. *Gr. Nazianzen*, leſt any one ſhould think he ſpeaks in the place cited, of a meer Figure without the ſubſtance, in the ſame Oration he thus exhorts his Auditors: *Eat without confuſion, and without doubting the Body, and drink the Bloud of thy Saviour, if thou deſireſt to have Life; and refuſe not to give credit to the words which are ſpoken concerning his Fleſh: neither be ſcandaliz'd at his Paſſion. Be conſtant, firm, and ſtable, not wavering in any thing for the ſayings of thy Adverſaries.*

And in *Orat.* 11. he ſays thus of his Siſter *Gorgonia: She proſtrates her ſelf with Faith before the Altar, and with a great cry calls upon him, who is worſhipped on it.*

DEFENCE.

It is not ſo apparent, that in the firſt Teſtimony the *Repreſenter* mentions out of *Nazianzen*, he ſpeaks of the Euchariſt at all, or if he does, onely by alluſion. Theſe words that go before what he cites, [*Do not ſtumble in thy mind, when thou hearеſt of the Bloud of God, of his Paſſion and Death; nor impiouſly fall, when thou would ſt be thought Gods defender; but eat without confuſion, and without*

without doubting the Body, and drink the Bloud of thy Saviour, if thou deſireſt to have Life] look like his Advice to a good Chriſtian that was tempted by an Heathen to forſake Chriſt becauſe of his Ignominious Death and Paſſion; counſelling him, when he reflects upon his Paſſion and Bloud, to make it the Food of his Soul by which he may live eternally. Wherein he ſeems to allude to *Joh.* 6. *My fleſh is meat indeed*, &c. and therefore it follows, *Refuſe not to give credit to the words that are ſpoken concerning his Fleſh, neither be ſcandalized at his Paſſion.* This, with ſubmiſſion, ſeems a probable ſence. But admitting the words are to be underſtood of the Euchariſt, I deſire the *Repreſenter* to ſhew how they make for Tranſubſtantiation; for I can ſee nothing in them to give ſo much as a colour to it.

But then for his ſecond Inſtance, from what *Nazianzen* ſays of his Siſter *Gorgonia*, he had better a great deal have paſs'd it over. What he ſays of her Proſtration before the Altar, and calling loudly upon him that is honoured (τιμώμενον) on it, does not prove that the Natural Body of Chriſt was included there, or that ſhe worſhipped that when ſhe fell down at the Altar, but all the Honour was pay'd to him; though upon occaſion of her approach to that place, where ſo many Teſtimonies of his Divine Favour and Love are wont to be exhibited, ſhe fell down there with ſingular Devotion: and ſo he knows we do alſo.

But what will he ſay now to ſome other matters in that Relation which he conceals? What thinks he of his calling the parts of the Euchariſt, the *Antitypes of Chriſt's pretious Body and Bloud?* When as *Epiphanius* the Deacon himſelf, in the ſecond Council of *Nice* †, could ſay of the Euchariſt, *If it be an Image of his Body, it cannot be the Divine Body it ſelf:* And *Gaudentius* ‖,

† Act. 6.

‖ Tract. 2. In Exod.

That *the Figure is not the Verity, but the Reſemblance of the Verity.* What thinks he of the *parcels* of it, which ſhe heaped together in her hands, of the *mixing* it with her Tears, and uſing it like a *Medicine*, anointing as it were her whole body with it; all which are there related: but all very ill accord with his Sentiments about the Euchariſt, and with Tranſubſtantiation.

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
St. *Auſtin* (de Doct. Chriſtian. l. 3. c. 5.) ſays, *Indeed this is a miſerable bondage of the Soul, to take the Signs inſtead of the things ſignified.*	St. *Auſtin* in his explication of the 98 Pſalm, expounding thoſe words, *Adore his foot-ſtool*, ſays thus: *I enquire what this his foot-ſtool is, and the Scripture makes me anſwer,* The Earth is my foot-ſtool. *Here now wavering I turn my ſelf to Chriſt, becauſe it's he I ſeek here, and I am forthwith ſatisfied how the Earth may be adored without ſacriledge*, (impiety in St. *Auſtin*) *and his foot-ſtool, without the guilt of idolatry*, (without impiety, it's the ſame
And (in *Pſal.* 98.) in the Perſon of Chriſt, ſpeaking to his Diſciples, ſays thus: *You are not to eat this Body which you ſee, or to drink that Bloud which my Crucifiers ſhall pour forth: I have commended to you the Sacrament, which being ſpiritually underſtood, ſhall quicken you.*	

word again.) *For he took Earth of Earth, Fleſh being of Earth, and he took Fleſh of the Fleſh of* Mary. *And becauſe he converſed here with us in that Fleſh, and gave us that very Fleſh to eat, for the ſalvation of our Souls; and there is no body eats that Fleſh, without adoring it firſt:*

firſt: 'tis evident, how that foot-ſtool of our Lord may be ador'd, and that we are ſo far from ſinning in adoring it, that we ſin if we do not adore it.

DEFENCE.

The *Dublin Letter*, from among a vaſt number of Teſtimonies he might have brought out of St. *Auſtin*, for confirmation of our Doctrine, and confutation of theirs, has choſen onely a few, but pertinent ones. His firſt ſays, That *it is a miſerable bondage to take the Signs inſtead of the things ſignified:* Or as he ſays in the ſame Chapter, *When that which is figuratively ſpoken, is taken as if it were properly ſpoken, it is carnally underſtood.* Which he did not ſay by chance, for he repeats it two or three times in that Book, calling it a *ſervile Infirmity*, and *carnal bondage*. *Cyril* of *Alexand.* ſtill more ſmartly: * *Thoſe ſenſeleſs Hereticks are to be laught at, who take what is put in order of a ſign, for the Truth of the thing.* We that underſtand the Euchariſt as God inſtituted it, for a *holy Sign* and *Repreſentation*, can well clear our ſelves, let the *Repreſenter* bring himſelf off as well as he can. * In Joh. 1. 32, 33.

The ſecond Teſtimony in the Letter is very home: *You are not to eat this Body which you ſee*, &c. *I have recommended to you a Sacrament*, &c. Here now is that which the *Author of ſucceſſion of Church and Sacraments*, calls a *pregnant Negative*; and, as he ſays, has the force of a double ſtroak, affirming and denying in one and the ſame breath: And ſeeing he calls for ſuch proofs, let him take notice of this, & we ſhall give him many more ſuch. P. 33.

Againſt this proof, the *Repreſenter* ſets in oppoſition other words of St. *Auſtin* upon the ſame 98 Pſalm, concerning *adoring his foot-ſtool*, that is, *the Earth*; which

St. *Auſtin* interprets alegorically *of Chriſts fleſh given to us for to eat, and that none eat it without firſt adoring it,* &c. See here now the *Repreſenter*'s ingenuity; for St. *Auſtin*, after what he cites out of him, interprets all himſelf; which either he did not know, or would not let us know it from him: nay, which is more ſtill, thoſe very words which the *Letter* urges, are part of St. *Auſtin*'s interpretation, and I am ſure ſpeak nothing to his purpoſe or for his comfort. For thus he goes on, a few lines after what the Repreſenter cites: *When thou adoreſt him, let not thy thoughts dwell on the fleſh, leſt thou ſhouldſt not be quickned by the Spirit: for ſays he* (Chriſt) the ſpirit quickneth, the fleſh profiteth nothing. *When our Lord commended this, ſaying to them as he had ſaid before of his fleſh,* Except a man eat my fleſh, he has not eternal life in him. *Upon this ſome of his Diſciples almoſt ſeventy were ſcandaliz'd, and ſaid,* This is a hard ſaying, who can underſtand it? and they departed and walked no more with him. *This of eating his fleſh,* &c. *ſeem'd a hard ſaying: for they underſtood it fooliſhly, and thought of it carnally, and imagin'd that our Lord was about to cut off ſome parcels from his body to give to them, and they ſaid,* This is a hard ſaying. *But it was they that were hard, not the ſaying: for if they had not been hard, but meek, they would have ſaid within themſelves, He ſays not this without a cauſe, but by reaſon of ſome Sacrament hid there; they had ſtayed meekly with him, and learnt that from him which his Diſciples that tarried did learn---for he inſtructed thoſe, and told them,* It is the ſpirit that quickneth, &c. The words that I have ſpoken to you, are ſpirit and life. *Underſtand ſpiritually what I have ſaid, for it is not this body you ſee,* &c. as above in the Letter.

Is it not a ſtrange confidence of one that deals thus with

with the Fathers, to ſay as the *Repreſenter* does, (*pag.* 22.) 'That to any eye, that is not blinded like ours, it's evi-'dent, that the Fathers deliver themſelves moſt large-'ly and fully in the behalf of Tranſubſtantiation; and 'that among all the *Ends of Texts* we have picked out 'of them, there is not ſo much as one directly contra-'ry to what we hold? If it had been poſſible for us to have directed St. *Auſtin*'s Pen, and told him what we had a mind he ſhould have expreſs'd, we could not have choſe better our ſelves, than he has for us, in the words recited. But when one expoſes himſelf ſo effectually as he has done in this matter, it's in vain to add any more words concerning it. To go on therefore to the next Citation.

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
S. *Auſtin* elſewhere ſays, (*Cont. Adamant. cap.* 12.) *Chriſt brought them to a Banquet, in which he commended to his Diſciples the Figure of his Body and Blood, for he did not doubt to ſay,* This is my Body, *when he gave the ſign of his Body.*	*Id. Lib.* 12. *Con. Fauſt. c.* 10. he ſays, *For the Blood of Chriſt upon Earth has a loud Voice, when all people receiving it, anſwer,* Amen. *This is the plain voice of the Blood, which the very Blood it ſelf ſpeaks out of the mouths of the Faithful, who are redeem'd by the ſame Blood.* And

c. 20. he calls the Euchariſt, *The Sacrament of Hope, by which the Church is at this Time united, as long as that is drunk which flow'd from the ſide of Chriſt.*

DEFENCE.

That the Citation in the *Letter* may not be re-preached for an *end of a Text*, we'll try to pleaſe him with ſome part of a Diſcourſe of St. *Auſtin*'s to the *Newly Baptized*, which is cited by many of the Ancients, * *Hoc quod vidiſtis in Altari Dei, &c. This which you ſee upon God's Altar, you were ſhewn laſt night; but you have not yet heard what it is, what it meaneth, and of how great a thing this is a Sacrament. That which you ſee is Bread and the Cup; thus much your own eyes inform you: But that wherein your Faith needs inſtruction is, that this Bread is the Body of Chriſt, and the Cup the Blood of Chriſt—— You may be apt to ſay to me, you require us to believe, expound to us, that we may underſtand. Such a thought as this may ariſe in any mans heart, we know that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt took fleſh of the Virgin* Mary*— was put to death— roſe again the third day— aſcended into Heaven— where he is now ſitting at the right hand of the Father. How is Bread his Body? and how is the Cup, or what the Cup contains, his Blood?* A very natural Queſtion; let's now ſee how St. *Auſtin* reſolves it; even thus: *Theſe, my brethren, are therefore ſtiled Sacraments, becauſe in them we ſee one thing and underſtand another. That which we ſee hath a bodily nature; that which is underſtood, hath a ſpiritual fruit*, or efficacy.

* Fulgentius de Bapt. Æthiop. in Epiſt. ad Ferrand. Edit. per Sirmond, Paris 1612. Bede ad 1 Cor. 10. Bertram de corp. & ſangu. Domini, propè finem.

This is ſo plain that it needs no Commentary, though a large one to our purpoſe might eaſily be made upon it: concerning giving credit to what our eyes inform us; his aſſerting in ſo many words, that *this Bread is Chriſt's Body, this Cup his Blood*, referring to the *words of Inſtitution*, which, if underſtood in a proper ſence, *Bellar-*

Bellarmine and others oft tell us, are abſurd and impoſſible, and imply a contradiction; ſince *bread* and *Chriſt's Body* are things moſt different (*diſparata*) in Nature; and yet you ſee St. *Auſtin* lays it down for true; onely explains it all *Sacramentally* and *Spiritually*, becauſe in the Sacrament *Bread* and *Wine* repreſent *Chriſt's Body* and *Blood*, and exhibit the fruit and ſpiritual benefit of them to us.

And what now does the *Repreſenter* put in the other Scale to weigh all down? Two Expreſſions of his. The one where St. *Auſtin* brings in theſe words of *God* to *Cain*, *The blood of thy brother crys to me from the Earth*, and then adds, by way of alluſion, *The blood of Chriſt has a loud voice upon Earth*, (not as he renders it, the blood of Chriſt upon Earth, &c.) *for all Nations when they receive it, anſwer, Amen.* And then adds what the *Repreſenter* cites of its *ſpeaking out of the mouths of the faithful*, &c. But, alas! this elegant Phraſe does no more ſuppoſe, that the Blood of Chriſt, in a proper ſence, is in the mouths of the Faithful, than another ſuch Phraſe of St. *Auſtin's* does, who, upon occaſion of that Speech of St. *Peter* to *Chriſt*, *Lord, to whom ſhall we go, thou haſt the words of eternal life*, ſays thus, * *The fleſh of our Lord had a good reliſh in his mouth.* In a word, the *Amen* might be pronounced by all that received the Euchariſt, as acknowledging it to be Chriſt's Blood by which they were redeemed, which was there repreſented, and that they deſired and hoped to receive all ſpiritual advantages thereby. For ſo in that Diſcourſe of *his*, to the *Newly baptized*, after the words I cited before, follow theſe: *If thou wouldſt underſtand the body of Chriſt, hear what the Apoſtle ſays to the faithful*, Ye are Chriſt's Body and Members. *If then ye are ſuch, your Myſtery is placed on the Lord's Table,*

* Tract. 11. in Johan.

Table, ye receive the Myſtery of the Lord. Te anſwer, Amen, *to that which you are, and, by anſwering, ſubſcribe it; ſee thou beeſt a Member of Chriſt's Body, that it may be a true Amen.*

To the other Expreſſion he urges, of *that being drunk which flowed from Chriſt's ſide*, that ſhort Anſwer may ſuffice, which St. *Auſtin* himſelf gives, when he ſays, † *De latere crucifixi percuſſo Sacramenta Eccleſiæ profluxerunt. From the pierced ſide of Chriſt crucified the Sacraments of the Church did flow.* Baptiſm as well as the Euchariſt; and therefore in the Euchariſt he that partakes of the Cup may be ſaid to *drink* of that which flowed from Chriſt's ſide, juſt as he that is Baptized may be ſaid to be *waſhed* with that which flowed from Chriſt's ſide.

† In Pſal. 103.

For what he ſays of the *Euchariſt*, *Iſidore* ‖ alſo ſays the ſame of *Baptiſm*, *It is the Water which, in the time of Chriſt's Paſſion, flowed from his ſide.* Yet from hence none can infer, that the Baptized perſon is waſhed with that individual Water that flowed thence, or that the Water in the Font is tranſubſtantiated into it.

‖ De Offic. Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 24.

Dublin Letter.

Auſtin (in Tract. 50. upon *John*) ſays, *How ſhall I lay hold on him who is abſent? how ſhall I reach my hands unto the Heavens, and touch him who ſits there? ſend thy faith thither, and thou haſt him ſure.*

To which I will add the next

Repreſenter.

Id. Comment. in *Pſalm* 33. where he ſpeaks thus of Chriſt: *And he was carried in his own hands. And can this, my brethren, be poſſible in man? was ever any man carried in his own hands? He may be carried by the hands of others; but in*

next words, *Thy forefathers held him in the flesh, do thou hold him in thy heart; for Christ, who is absent from us, is also present with us; for unless he were present, he could not be held by us; but that is true which he said,* Behold, I am with you always to the end of the world. — *Though he brought his Body into Heaven, he did not deprive the World of his Majesty*; i. e. of his Divinity.

in his own hand, no man was ever yet carried. How this can be literally understood of David, *we cannot discover. But in Christ we find it verified. For Christ was carried in his own hands, when giving his own very Body, he said,* This is my Body. *For that Body he carried in his own Hands. Such is the Humility of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

DEFENCE.

To that which St. *Austin* admirably councels us, to take hold on Christ, who now is absent from us, by Faith, and to hold and keep him in our hearts; the *Representer* opposes a Saying of his, of *carrying his body in his hands*, and that Christ did this in the last Supper, when he gave his Body to them. This Expression the *Representer*, and they that contend for Transubstantiation, understand in a proper sense; notwithstanding all the Contradictions it does involve, of his being within and without himself, lesser and greater than himself, one in himself and yet divided from himself, and the like.

But whatsoever might be said of St. *Austin*'s mistaken Translation of the Text, there being nothing to countenance it in the *Hebrew*, *that* David *carried himself in his own hands*; yet however the evidence is clear,

from St. *Auſtin* himſelf, that he did not underſtand the objected words, in the ſence of the *Roman* Church, but of ours. For in the very next Sermon, upon the ſame *Pſalm*, you may find theſe words of his: *How was he carried in his own hands? Becauſe when he commended his own Body and Blood, he took that in his hands which the Faithful know,* (quod norunt Fideles) *and did in ſome ſort* (quodammodo) *carry himſelf, when he ſaid,* This is my Body. That [*quodammodo*] *in a manner*, is intimation enough, that he did not mean properly ſo; and the other Expreſſion [*that which the Faithful know*] puts the matter out of doubt. For by this he meant to conceal ſomething from thoſe that were not admitted to the Sacraments (whom they called *Catechumens*) which others who were admitted to them (whom he calls *the Faithful*) did well underſtand. Now what was it, that he thus keeps as a Secret and a Myſtery, and would not expreſs plainly? I anſwer, In this place it was the *Bread*, which he would not name but by that Phraſe, [*which the Faithful know*] and that ſufficiently diſcovers it to us. I might, if it were needful, give abundance of Inſtances of the like manner of ſpeaking, in *Theodoret*, and other Fathers, when they would not name the Elements in the Euchariſt. But I'll confine my ſelf to St. *Auſtin*, who has this ſaying, * (I think more than once) *Penè quidem*. Sacramentum *omnes* Corpus *ejus dicunt*. *Almoſt all call the Sacrament his Body*; not expreſſing the *Bread* and *Wine*. To give but one Inſtance more, out of him, of this conceal'd way of ſpeaking, in reſpect of *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament. *They that read*, ſays he, † *know what* Melchiſedek *brought forth* (which was Bread and Wine) *when he bleſſed* Abraham, *and they that partake of it, ſee ſuch a Sacrifice now offered to God throughout the whole*

* De verb. Dom. Ser. 53.

† Contra Adverſ. Legis, l. 1. c. 20.

whole World. So that the Sum of the Obſervation is this, that becauſe Chriſt took Bread in his hands, recommending it to his Diſciples for his Body, he did as it were carry his Body in his hands. And, if this be not plain enough, I am ſure that of *Bede* ‖ upon the ‖ In Pſal. 33.
ſame *Pſalm* will make it ſo. *Chriſt*, ſays he, *was carried in a manner* (*quodammodo* again) *in his own hands, when in the laſt Supper, he reached the Bread, conſecrated and commended by his own mouth to his Diſciples, ſaying,* This is my Body.

Dublin Letter.

St. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe, (*in* 1 *Cor.* c. 10.) *What is that which the Bread ſignifies? the Body of Chriſt.* You ſee he calls it Bread, and ſays it ſignifies Chriſt's Body.

And in another place (*ad Cæſarium Monach.*) he ſays, *That after Conſecration the Bread is worthy of the name of the Body of Chriſt, although the Nature of the Bread remain ſtill in it.*

Repreſenter.

St. Chryſoſt. Hom. de Euchar. Where, ſpeaking of the bleſſed Sacrament, he ſays thus: *Do you ſee Bread? Do you ſee Wine? does this go into the Draught like other food? God forbid, do not think ſo. For as Wax, when joyn'd with the fire, is likened unto it, ſo that nothing of the ſubſtance of it is left, nothing remains: ſo here conceive the Myſteries to be conſumed with the ſubſtance of the Body.*

2. And *Hom.* 83. *in Matth. Chriſt did not think it enough to become Man, to be ſcourged and murdered; but he incorporates himſelf with us, and not by faith onely, but in reality makes us his Body.*

3. *Many Mothers there are, who feed their Infants at a Stranger's Breasts; but Christ does not so: he nourishes us with his own Blood.*

4. *The things we propose, are not done by humane power. He that wrought those things at the last Supper, is the Author of what is done here: we hold but the place of Ministers, but he that sanctifies and changes them is Christ himself.*

5. And *Hom.* 24. *in Ep.* 1. *ad Cor. That which is in the Chalice, is the same that flowed from his side, and we are Partakers of it. He pour'd out this very Blood, that we might not remain in Error; and he not onely pour'd it out, but he has likewise given the very same to us. Wherefore, says he to us, If you desire Blood, do not colour the Altars of Idols with the Blood of Beasts, but upon mine Altar offer up my Blood.*

6. And *Lib.* 3. *de Sacerd. O Miracle! He that sits above with his Father, at the very same instant of time, is here in the hands of all; he gives himself to all that are willing to receive him.*

7. And *Hom.* 46. *in Joban. The Devils, when they behold the Blood of Christ within us, are put to flight, and the Angels come in. This Blood purified the Holy of Holies; and if the Figure of it had so great vertue in the Temple of the Jews, and when sprinkled on the Doors of the Egyptians, it has much greater now being the Truth.*

DEFENCE.

The *Letter* has onely made choice of two Passages out of this Father, when many others might have been alledged, and the last of the two, is very weighty indeed; for it affirms expressly, that the *Nature* of Bread remains in the Eucharist after its Consecration, though

at the same time it is dignified with the name of the *Lords Body.* We may be sure this Testimony is very considerable, because such wonderful care was taken in *France* to suppress it, after the whole Letter, of which this is onely a little shred, was transcribed out of the *Florentine Library*, and prepared for the Press; but when printed off, that sheet was taken from the rest where this Letter was, and suppressed, but has happily been rescued. Of all which an account has been given at large, and the force of it urged against Transubstantiation, by the Learned Author of the *Defence of the Exposition of our Churches Doctrine*, against the Bishop of *Meaux*, to whom I refer the Reader.

The *Representer* look'd upon it as a Ponderous Testimony, by his putting so many *Ends of Texts* (to use his own phrase) out of St. *Chrysostom*, into the opposite Scale, more than against any other passage besides. But alas! he may throw in twenty more, if he can find them, after these he has given us, and it will not stir nor advance a jot.

For as for the first place which he cites, all the colour it has by his false translation, will be wiped off by a true one, which is thus out of the Greek. *Do not look upon it as Bread, nor consider it as Wine; for it does not go into the draught like other food: far be it from thee to think so. For as Wax when joyned to the fire, leaves no dross or superfluity,* ([illegible]) *so here conceive the Mysteries to be consumed with the substance of the Body.* The sense of which is, that St. *Chrysostom* would not have us attend to the Elements as to common Food, nor consider them meerly as Bread and Wine, or think that they pass through us as other meats do, (wherein he differs from *Origen* and other antient Writers) but are converted wholly into the substance of our Body,

so as to increase that, (as Wax does the fire) and to be consumed with it ‖. Which cannot be said of the natural Body of Christ, which is subject to no such change or consumption; and must suppose that the Elements after consecration, do in their substance remain, or else they could not be the subjects neither of such changes.

‖ Concerning the word ἀτμιδίζειν, which is taken from melted metals, that lose by the scum & dross that in the fire separates from them, see *Salmasius de Transubst.* p. 322.

As for the second place he cites, if he had but added some words that follow, he might have seen them to be so hyperbolical, that they can admit no other meaning but that which is figurative: for S. *Chrysostom* goes on thus: *How should not the very Sun-beams be less pure than that hand which divides this flesh, that mouth which is filled with spiritual fire, that tongue which is purple-red with this tremendous Bloud.* The proper and natural Body of Christ cannot be divided nor broken into parts; nor his Bloud, which is not out of his Body, colour our Tongues, and therefore must be referred to the Sacrament and the Mysteries in a congruous sense. Besides, that which cuts the sinews of all these Rhetorical flights concerning the Eucharist is, that the Fathers use such expressions indifferently concerning Baptism. Thus our St. *Chrysostom* * exhorts those that were to be baptized, *To adorn themselves with the Purple Garment died in our Lords Bloud:* And so *Isidore* †, *The true Israel enters into the Red Sea, to wit, Baptism, signed with the Bloud of Christ.* When the *Representer* tells us out of St. *Chrysostom*, That *Christ incorporates himself with us, and in reality makes us his Body*: We tell him also, what he says of the effects of Baptism, ‖ to one that was about to receive it; *Thou shalt presently embrace our Lord himself, be mingled with his Body, be incorporated into that Body which is seated above, whither the Devil cannot approach.* And again, * *How are we of his flesh and of his bones? — This*, says he, *we become by baptism.*

* Catech. ad Illumin.

† De vocat. Gent. c. 23.

‖ In Epist. ad Colos. Hom 6.

* In Epist. ad Ephes. Hom. 20.

As

As for his third inſtance out of him, where he ſays, *Chriſt nouriſhes us with his own Bloud*; that he may do both in the Sacrament and out of it; but he does not ſay, that the mouth that receives this nouriſhment is that *of our bodies*, but all may and muſt be done *ſpiritually*, by that νοητὸν στόμα, *that intellectual mouth of the inward man*, as St. *Baſil*'s phraſe is †.

† In Pſal. 33.

If what he ſays again in the fourth inſtance, [that *the things we propoſe are not done by humane power*, viz. in the Euchariſt] is a good proof of Tranſubſtantiation there; then alſo, when he ſays of Baptiſm ‖, That *man brings nothing into the things propoſed, but all is a work of Gods power*; (which are almoſt the ſame words) it's as good a proof of Tranſubſtantiation *in Baptiſm* alſo, which the *Repreſenter* denies. If he mentions a change and ſanctification wrought by Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*; we heard before out of P. *Leo* *, *That a man that is received by Chriſt in Baptiſm, is not the ſame after it that he was before, but the Body of the regenerate is made the Fleſh of Chriſt crucified*; *a change wrought*, ſays he, *by the right hand of the moſt High.*

‖ In 1 Cor. Hom. 8.

* De Paſſion. Dom. Ser. 14.

In his fifth inſtance out of St. *Chryſoſtom*, the ſame is ſaid which we met with before in St. *Auſtin*, that *what is in the Chalice, is the ſame that flowed from Chriſt's ſide*, which we anſwered before: And when inſtead of the Bloud of Beaſts, he bids us *colour his Altar with his own Bloud*; it's an elegant Expreſſion indeed, but ſignifies onely what is done there by *Repreſentation* and *Commemoration* of Chriſt's Paſſion. And ſo *Euſebius* † underſtood it, *Becauſe he no longer deſired bloudy Sacrifices.... he delivered* (to his Diſciples) *Bread to be uſed for a Symbol of his Body.*

† Demon. Ev. lib. 8.

In the ſixth Citation, where St. *Chryſoſtom* ſeems to make Chriſt, *who ſits above with God, at the ſame inſtant*

to

to give himself into the hands of all that are ready to receive him, if these are to be understood in a proper sense; let the *Representer* try whether the words a little before, which seem to be as wonderful, can be interpreted without a Figure. *When thou seest thy Lord lying before thee slain, and the Priest standing by the Sacrifice praying, and all the people died red with his precious Blood, dost thou think thy self to be any longer among men, and to stand on the Earth.* I suppose for all this elegant flight of his, their Bodies were not in more places than one, wherever their Souls were carried; nor that Christ's Body did in a proper sense lie dead and slain in the Eucharist, nor that his Blood, as poured out of his veins, did make the Communicants to be died all in purple gore. If the *Representer* thinks so, I am sure he understands not the sense of his own Church.

What St. *Chrysostom* says in the seventh and last instance he gives us, *That the Devils are put to flight when they behold the Blood of Christ within us*; the words [*within us*] are of his own adding, and not in the Text. But as for the effects mentioned by him, he argues indeed, that if Christ's Blood had such vertue and power in *the Type*, before his Incarnation, and before the Sacrifice was offered, it will have much more now that this Blood is actually shed and poured out upon the Cross for the expiation of sins; and this he calls *the Truth*, to wit, the actual exhibition of what was onely before in type and shadow; and the representation and commemoration of it, as thus actually shed at the Lords Table in the Eucharist. For thus he expresses himself, in another Homily *: *O wonderful! the mystical Table is prepared, the Lamb of God is slain for thee---the Blood for thy purification is emptied from his immaculate side into the Cup.* It was emptied out of the veins of his Body, onely

* De Euchar. in Encæniis.

onely on the Cross, and as so separated from his Body, even in the opinion of the Church of *Rome* it self, is not in the Eucharist (for that would destroy their Doctrine of *Concomitancy*) save onely in the Symbol and Representation. But they that urge these things to be still done in the Letter, may as well so interpret another place of St. *Chrysostom*, in the same Homily. *Think not that you receive the Divine Body at from the hands of a man, but as from the* Seraphins *themselves, in Tongs of fire which* Esaias *saw; and so receive his saving Bloud, as if you touched his divine and immaculate side with your lips.*

Thus I think I have made good what I said before, that all the Sayings of this Father which the *Representer* has heaped together, with all his Rhetorick thrown in to boot, has not been the force to perswade Transubstantiation (which, let the Reader again remember, does not onely suppose that Christ is corporally present in the Eucharist, but also that the substance of the Elements of Bread and Wine, are no more remaining there after consecration) as that one Testimony of his, in his Epistle to *Cæsarius*, is sufficient to confute it, being utterly irreconcilable to the notion of Transubstantiation.

Dublin Letter.	*Representer.*
St. *Macarius*, Scholar to St. *Anthony*, saith, (Hom. 27.) *In the Church Bread and Wine are offered, the Type of his Flesh and Bloud; and they who are Partakers of the Visible Bread, do spiritually eat the Flesh of the Lord.*	St. *Cyril Alex.* Ep. ad Colos. cited by St. *Thomas*: *That we should not feel horror to see flesh and bloud on the sacred Altars, God condescending to our frailty, flows into the things offered the Power of Life; converting them into the Verity*

of his own Flesh: to the end the Body of Life be found in us, as a certain quickning Seed.

St. Greg. Nyss. c. 37. *I do now rightly believe, that the Bread sanctified by the Word of God, is chang'd into the Body of God by the Word.*

DEFENCE.

This place of *Macarius* speaks a Language so different from what the Roman Church teaches, that it might have deserved a cast of his skill to reconcile it to their present Belief. But since that was a harder task, than to pick out (as the *Representer* does) a Saying or two to combat with it, I'll take notice here in short, how remarkably it agrees with our Doctrine, and opposes theirs. As *first*, That *Macarius* calls the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, the *Type* (or *Antitype*, which is the same) of Christ's Flesh and Bloud; therefore it cannot be in a proper sense his Flesh & Bloud it self: for as *Cyril Alexandr.* * says, *A Type is not the Truth, but imports an Image* or likeness *of the Truth.* And so St. *Ambrose* †, *It is impossible that any one should be an Image to himself. Secondly*, That he makes the Oblation made by the Church, even after Consecration, to be Bread and Wine: for before Consecration he could not call it an Antitype or Symbol, since it's Consecration that makes it so, which otherwise would be but common Bread and Wine; but if after Consecration there remains Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, then Transubstantiation is destroyed. *Thirdly*, He asserts, that the Communicants in taking the Visible Bread, spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ; which is our Doctrine to a Tittle. So that he knew of nothing to be eaten there, with the Mouth of our Bodies, but Bread; and what was to be done further, was to be done spiritually; just as St. *Austin* ||, in reference

* In cap. 6. Amos.

† De fide, l. 1. c. 4.

|| In verb. Dom. Ser. 33.

to

to the Living Bread that came down from Heaven, bids men, *Not to prepare their jaws, but their heart, for the eating of it.*

Now against this pregnant Testimony, the *Representer* gives us a Saying of *Cyril*, as cited by St. *Thomas*, (it is in his *Catena aurea* upon Luke 22.) I know not any thing in *Cyril's* words, can be drawn to favour Transubstantiation, unless it be one phrase of *Converting them into the Verity of his own Flesh*; which may seem to look like a conversion of the substance of the Elements into Christ's true and proper Body. But alas! by the diligence of Mr. *Aubertin* * the promising aspect of this place is utterly spoiled. For he has found evidently, that *Aquinas* his Citation is corrupt, in that it agrees not with *Billius's* Translation of *Elias Cretensis* his Commentary upon *Nazianzen*, who mentions this passage of *Cyril*, but instead of the *Verity of his Flesh*, says the *Operation of his Flesh*. But that which is more considerable is, that he finds it disagreeing with *Cyril's* Greek, which is found both printed and in Manuscript: (and though they do not agree one with another in this passage, yet both agree against the Citation of *Aquinas*.) That which is printed is in the *Catena* upon St. *Matthew*, set out by the Jesuit *Possinus*, who reads the place thus: [μεθίστησιν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς] *has changed them into the efficacy of his Life.* The other is a Manuscript of *Victor Antiochenus* on the 14th of St. *Mark*, in the Kings Library, who citing this of *Cyril*, reads, [πρὸς ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς] *into the efficacy of his Flesh*: where though he mentions the *Flesh of Christ*, yet still it is the *Efficacy* or *Energy*, not as *Aquinas* has it, *the Verity* of his Flesh. But now without this, neither his saying that Christ *instils the power of Life into the Oblations*, nor that he *changes them into the efficacy of his*

* In *Cyril Alexandr.*

Flesh, will serve the purpose of Transubstantiation; which will not be contented with a *virtual*, but requires a *substantial change*.

But perhaps the *Representer* thinks he has found this, in the second Testimony he gives us out of *Greg. Nyssen*, of *the sanctified Bread being changed into the Body of God by the Word*; or rather into the Body of God the Word (εἰς σῶμα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι.) But I believe he will find himself much mistaken: for this speaks no more of what is done *in the Eucharist*, than what we noted before out of St. *Cyril* is done in *Baptism*, when he said, *That the sensible water by the efficacy of the Spirit is transelemented into a divine virtue*; or what *Greg. Nazianzen* says †, *I am changed into Christ in Baptism*. To go no further for instances than to *Greg. Nyssen* himself. Let the *Representer* tell me what change he means, when he says of Christ ‖, That *his flesh was not the same with his Divinity, till this also was changed into the Divinity*. To go no further than to this very Catechetical Oration cited by the *Representer*, let him tell us what change *Nyssen* means, when he says, *As when a destructive thing is mixed with a sound one, whatsoever is so mingled, becomes unprofitable; so the immortal body* (of Christ) *when it is within him that receives it, does change the whole into its own Nature*. If he can think of some other change besides that of Substances, when Christ's flesh is changed into his Divinity, or when we are changed into Christ's Body; why cannot he imagine there may be a change of Bread into Christ's Body, without such a substantial one as Transubstantiation supposes. *Greg. Nyssen* himself may help him a little, when in the immediate words before those he objects, he says, *The Body by inhabitation of God the Word, is changed into a divine Dignity*: And he may, one would think, be enlightned by that of

† Orat. in Sanct. Bapt.

‖ Contr. Eunom. lib. 5.

of *Cyril*, which I'll again repeat. *God inſtils into the things offered, the power of Life, converting them into the Energy* (not into the ſubſtance) *of his own fleſh.*

Dublin Letter.	*Repreſenter.*
No man expreſſes himſelf more plainly in this matter, than Pope *Gelaſius*, whoſe words are theſe: (de 2 Natur. in Chriſto. adv. Eutych. & Neſt. p. 233. Baſ. 1528.) *The Sacraments which we receive of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt are a divine thing, by means whereof we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature, and yet the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine doth not ceaſe to be.*	Here the Author has made a new Pope; for this was another *Gelaſius*, as is prov'd at large by *Bellarmine:* and if the words immediately following the Text, cited in the ſame Author, be added, the difficulty is remov'd; which are theſe: *They* (the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine) *do paſs into a divine ſubſtance, the Holy Ghoſt effecting, yet remaining in the propriety of their Nature.*

If it be here anſwered, that after Popes have declared otherwiſe, I have but one requeſt to deſire of them, *viz.* to make it appear, that when two Popes ſhall determine both parts of a Contradiction to be true, they both are infallible in ſo doing.

DEFENCE.

I could not but ſmile when I met with this paſſage, [*Here the Author has made a new Pope*] to ſee the confidence of this Writer, without ſutable skill or reading to ſupport it, much like *their Accidents* in the Euchariſt, that

that can ſubſiſt in nothing. I hope it is not the cuſtom of our men, to outface a matter that has been ſcann'd and canvaſs'd on all ſides, and determin'd by the Judgment of thoſe that have moſt skill in the affair. But I perceive his Reading lies in a very little compaſs, and he is ſcarce acquainted with what his own Authors have ſaid, much leſs ours. In this matter before us, what *Gelaſius* was the Author of the Book *de Duabus Naturis in Chriſto*, &c. he takes up with *Bellarmine*'s opinion about it, and thinks he has ſaid enough to prove that this *Gelaſius* was no Pope of *Rome*. But alas! ſince *Bellarmine*'s time, this has been further examined: and if he had conſulted onely the *Jeſuit Labbe*'s Diſſertations (upon *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, which *Bellarmine* has given an account of) on the Head of *P. Gelaſius*, there he might have found how thoſe great and noted Criticks, *Sirmondus*, *Petavius*, *Chiffletius*, &c. *re melius diſcuſsâ*, after a more thorough diſcuſſing of the matter, eſpecially upon the Teſtimony of *Fulgentius* in his Anſwer to the Queſtions of *Ferrandus*, and upon the plain evidence of ſtyle that the Author wrote in *Latin*, and was not a *Greek*, had owned it for his, and that the Cauſe was given up, as no longer, after ſuch evidence, defenſible. And I aſſure him he may truſt that *Jeſuit*, both as a man of skill, and as one who never in his life granted one Line of an antient Author in queſtion, to the *Heretical Criticks*, whom he gives ſo many ill names to, till it could be no longer maintained. However, it may be ſeaſonable upon the *Repreſenter*'s falſe accuſation, to ask him what he thinks of their New Convert at *Putney*, who ſeems to have taken the *Pope*'s work out of his hand (and ſo making *himſelf* a kind of one) in making a new Saint of *Paſchaſius* *, who I think was never in any *Kalendar* for one before; or what he

* Conſenſ. vet. pag. 97.

ſays

ſays to the *Author of the Succeſſion of Church and Sacraments*, who with skill and confidence equal to his own, has made *Ephrem Syrus*, who was onely a *Deacon* of *Edeſſa*, to be a new *Proto-Patriarch of Antioch*; and was ſo well acquainted with the opinions of *Rabanus Maurus*, that (*p.* 26.) he cites for his words, the words of *Raſchaſius Radbertus*; juſt as if I ſhould pretend to tell you the opinion of *Calvin*, by giving it in the words of *Bellarmine*: for ſo much difference there was betwixt the Sentiments of *Rabanus* and *Paſchaſius*, concerning the Euchariſt. Theſe are fit Writers to give us the ſenſe of the Fathers, who know not how to diſtinguiſh one antient Author from another, no not when they are known to be of quite different Belief. P. 27.

But to return to the Teſtimony of Pope *Gelaſius*, for ſo I will now venture to call him. Although the *Repreſenter*'s critical faculty in relation to Authors, be very ſleight and mean, yet perhaps he may be more diſcerning in the ſenſe of their words, when they lie before him. He tells us, *If the words immediately following the Text, cited in* Gelaſius, *be added, the difficulty is removed.* I have told him twice or thrice before, that he had better content himſelf with our *Ends of Texts*, as he calls 'em, which we cite out of the Fathers, ſince we rather do him a kindneſs herein: for the further he proceeds to tell us what they ſay, the leſs he will find in them, agreeing with his Sentiments; and it's well if it do not prove ſo here. Inſtead therefore of his ſmall addition, I will ſet down the whole paſſage out of *Pope Gelaſius*, to ſee whether we have not more reaſon to challenge him *for ours*, than he *for theirs*. The whole runs thus:

The Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, are a divine thing, for which reaſon by them we are made Partakers

kers of the Divine Nature, and yet the substance or nature of Bread and Wine, does not cease to be. And indeed the image and likeness of the Body and Blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the Mysteries: therefore it appears evidently enough, that we ought to think that of Christ our Lord, which we profess, celebrate, and receive in his Image; that as they (that is, the Elements) *pass into that divine substance, the Holy Ghost effecting it, their nature remaining still in its own property: so that principle Mystery, whose efficiency and vertue they* (that is, the Elements) *represent to us, remains one entire and true Christ; those things of which he is made up* (*viz.* his two natures) *remaining in their properties.*

And now pray what has he gained by hearing all? The very first words cited by the Letter, [*the substance or nature of Bread or Wine, do not cease to be*] is inconsistent with Transubstantiation, which makes the substance and nature of them cease, and onely accidents to remain, which are not the substance or nature of Bread and Wine. But by what follows in *Gelasius*, the difficulty on his side is so far from being removed, as he pretends, that it is evidently increased: not onely by his calling what is done when we receive the Bread and Wine, the Similitude or Representation and Image of our Lord, which common sense (as well as the concurrent sense of Fathers) tells us cannot be the same, in a proper sense, with that to which it is like; but especially by his comparing this Similitude with the Principal and Original, and his making all to run parallel between them. So that *as the Bread* (which *as* he leaves out) *and Wine pass into the divine substance, the Holy Ghost effecting it, their nature still remaining in its own property, so that principal mystery*, &c. Which in plainer speech is thus, to give you his way of reasoning: That since

ſince the Bread and Wine, which repreſent Chriſt's Fleſh and Bloud, whatſoever they become in vertue, and are advanced to effect by the power of the Holy Ghoſt, yet ſtill they continue in ſubſtance the ſame that they were before; in like manner the Humane Nature of Chriſt (which they are the Image of) though it is united to the Divinity, yet thereby one Nature is not loſt and ſwallowed up in the other, but both ſubſiſt diſtinctly in the Perſon of Chriſt, who is but one. Thus the Parallel runs exactly. But now what a fine confutation had this been, of thoſe that believed no Humane Nature, if *Gelaſius* had believed Tranſubſtantiation, and that no ſubſtance of Bread and Wine remained in the Sacrament, but onely Accidents which did appear? They might have made good uſe of this for their purpoſe, and have granted that the Divinity of Chriſt might appear like fleſh and bloud, even when no ſubſtance of them, no humane nature remained, but onely his Divinity: and ſo his Argument againſt them from the Sacrament, which, as he manages it, is ſo ſtrong, would have been wholly enervated, and made the moſt ridiculous in the World.

Thus I have afforded a particular Conſideration to all the Teſtimonies the *Repreſenter* has produced from the Fathers; and not onely all along have added force where it was needful to thoſe Citations out of them, which the *Dublin Letter* had given us in ſhort; but alſo in the Examination of the *Repreſenter*'s Citations, have explained the ambiguous phraſes of the Fathers, and made a difference betwixt what they ſpeak as *Divines*, and what as *Orators*; between what they argue and debate againſt the Oppoſers of Catholick Doctrine, and what they hyperbolically expreſs in Sermons and

Homilies, to raiſe Paſſions in their Auditors, and to advance the viſible Elements in the Sacrament above contempt, and to raiſe their minds to a due valuation of what they repreſent and exhibit. The *Repreſenter*'s is a diſingenuous deſign, and a mean performance, not attempting to invalidate what we bring out of the Fathers to atteſt our Doctrine, any otherwiſe than by ſetting them in oppoſite Ranks like Enemies, making them ſeemingly to skirmiſh, and confidently telling us that *theirs* have got the better, and quite routed our Squadron: and after this noiſe of claſhing Weapons, *they* have a *Conſent of Fathers*; and by the duſt that they have raiſed, a *Cloud of Witneſſes*.

We ſhould not have choſen to expreſs our minds in ſuch a manner about the Sacraments, as ſome of them do: we may think that leſs myſterious expreſſions would have been more agreeable to ſuch an eaſie and plain ſubject, as the Scriptures make them to be. We do not perhaps ſo much admire their Caution, as the Church of *Rome* may do, in concealing from the uninitiated as a great ſecret, what they were afterwards to receive, ſo as not to be willing when any of them were preſent, ſo much as to name the *Bread* and *Wine*; when yet our Saviour called the one plainly the *Fruit of the Vine*, and his Apoſtles ſo often expreſs the Faithful's communicating in the Euchariſt, by *breaking of Bread*. But this we ſay further, That from the very higheſt ſtrains of the Fathers and moſt myſterious, Tranſubſtantiation cannot be inferred or proved. To uſe the
P. 22. *Repreſenter*'s own words, *Their expreſs belief of the real Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, their plain aſſertion of a ſupernatural Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt*, does not amount to it. For the Change they ſpeak of, is an advancement of the Elements

Elements in their uſe and vertue, without annihilation; a ſuffering them to be what they were in nature and ſubſtance, at the ſame time that they are made another thing. Tranſubſtantiation will allow nothing but their Accidents to remain without a ſubject, which none of the *Fathers* ever ſo much as dream'd of; and it will allow no other Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, but what ſuppoſes and produces a Real Abſence of the Bread and Wine; for a preſence of their ſhape and colour, &c. onely, is no preſence of the thing.

The *Dublin Letter*, after the conſideration of the Doctrine of the Fathers for ſeven hundred years after Chriſt, in oppoſition to Tranſubſtantiation, proceeds to give a ſhort account of the Innovation in *Paſchaſius Radbertus*'s time, and how it was oppoſed by *Jo. Scotus Erigena*, by *Bertram* and *Rabanus Maurus*; and how it was after their time a diſputable Queſtion in the Church. All this the Repreſenter takes no notice of at all very wiſely; wherefore I ſhall not tranſcribe it, but refer the Reader, if he knows nothing of that matter, to the Letter.

That which remains in the *Repreſenter*'s Paper, now we have done with the other, will be quickly diſpatch'd. Though he has not given us hitherto one real ſtroak to do us any prejudice, yet we find him, upon a review of his performances, clapping his wings and crowing. He might have ſpared his trifling Queſtion, Whether the Fathers could have taken the *Teſt*; which I think they might, for any thing he has made appear of their contrary ſenſe, as to this particular of the Euchariſt. He might have left out another ſport- P. 25.

ful Flurt of his about *Parliamentary Divinity*, which we underſtand no more than we do *Parliamentary Laws*. But I will mind him (to abate his mirth a little) of what *Scotus* ſays *, *That before the Lateran Council* (An. 1215.) *Tranſubſtantiation was no Article of Faith.* And that he may be acquainted how finely matters were carried, in that which they call a *General Council*, I deſire him onely to look into one Author † of his own Communion. There he may read the words of *Mat. Paris*, that after a Speech of Pope *Innocent*, ſixty capitula heads (brought in by himſelf) were read, *which to ſome of the Fathers ſeemed gentle, and to others burdenſome.* That the Council, which, after the Papal manner, carried a ſplendid appearance, ended *in Laughter and a Scoff*, when they ſaw how artificially the Pope had illuded all the Great men that came thither; how after he had got money, he then diſſolved the Council, and that *the whole Clergy went away ſad.* There he may meet with the words of *Godefrid* the Monk, who lived at that very time, who ſays, *That nothing was done in the Council worthy to be remembred, or that could be commended, ſave onely that the Eaſtern Church, a thing unheard of before, ſubmitted her ſelf to the Roman.* And what *Nauclerus* ſays, (with whom *Platina* in the Life of Pope *Innocent* III. agrees) that *many things came into conſultation, but nothing could be openly decreed.* After all this, I leave it to himſelf, to call the Divinity, that was firſt made an Article of Faith by a General Council where matters were thus managed, by what name he pleaſes.

* In lib. 4. Sent. diſt. 11.

•† *Widdrington's* Diſcuſſ. diſcuſſion. Decrat. Conc. Later. Part 1. Sect. 1.

The next work of the *Repreſenter*, is to miſrepreſent what the Author of the Letter affirms; and after to lay on ſome Colours, to make the Doctrine of his

his own Church, to look ſomewhat like the Doctrine of the Fathers.

The Letter (p. 7) not onely aſſerts that the Fathers held that *the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament remain what they were before Conſecration; that, that which is ſeen on the Holy Table is Bread, that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine does not ceaſe to be*: but adds, *That the Elements are Types, Symbols, and Figures of Chriſts Body and Bloud.* The *Repreſenter* leaves out the word [Elements] and the laſt words, [of Chriſts Body and Bloud] and makes the Proteſtant onely to object againſt them, that the *Fathers ſpeak of the Sacrament, and call it a Figure, a Sign, an Image, a Remembrance*; and herein place the contradiction to the Roman Churches Belief. Now this is all tricks, and an abuſe both of Us and of the Fathers.

How cautiouſly are things here phraſed? [*terming the Sacrament a Figure,*] and [*does not deny the Sacrament to be a Figure.*] The *Fathers* ſpeak more plainly, and without any ambiguity of words, as we have heard all along, though he dare not ſpeak like them. They ſpeak indeed of a *Sacrament*; but they ſay, without any heſitation, a *Sacrament of Bread*, as St. *Auſtin* *. *The Apoſtle commended the Unity of the Church in the Sacrament of Bread.* And in his Queſtions upon the Goſpels †. *By the Sacrament of Wine, Chriſt commended his Bloud.* And they not onely call the *Sacrament* a *Figure*; but, (as we have heard often) they ſay expreſly of *Bread* and *Wine*, that it is ſo. As *Tertullian* ſays, that Chriſt *Repreſented his Body by Bread*, and made *Bread the Figure of his Body.* And ſo *Macarius, Bread and Wine are offered-----and they who are partakers of the viſible Bread.* And St. *Chryſoſtom, What is that which the Bread ſignifies?* And in ano-

* De conſenſ. Evang. l. 3. c. 25.

† l. 1. qu. 43.

‖ Hom. 83 in *Matth.* another place ‖, *When our Lord gave the Myſteries he gave Wine.* Here now is more than *proving things by halves*, which he makes the Proteſtants to be guilty of. This is a *full* and *whole Proof.* For the Fathers that ſpeak of the *Sacrament of Bread and Wine*, make alſo the *Bread* and *Wine* to *remain in the Sacrament*, and as ſo remaining to be a *Figure, a Sign, and Symbol*; and they alſo ſay, that becauſe it is a Figure, and a Sign, *&c.* Therefore it is not the Truth, nor the Body and Bloud it ſelf of our Saviour; and all this put together, plainly confutes Tranſubſtantiation; this is *our way* of arguing from them.

Let's ſee now, what Colours the *Repreſenter* puts on, to make *his way* conſonant to the Fathers. Their

P. 23. Church (which he calls the *Catholick Church,*) *Teaches that the Body and Bloud of Chriſt are in the Bleſſed Sacrament really and ſubſtantially, and ſo indeed not onely in a Sign, Symbol, or Figure.*

Anſw. This is but ſaying by halves what his Church Teaches, when it teaches Tranſubſtantiation (and he knows that there is a Church that teaches this real and ſubſtantial preſence, which does not believe Tranſubſtantiation.) But when his Church further teaches, that there is no ſubſtance of Bread and Wine remaining in the Sacrament, what does he talk of *being not onely in* a Sign, Symbol, or Figure, when if the Bread and Wine do not remain, there is *no Sign, Symbol,* or *Figure*, according to the *Fathers:* (for as you have heard *They* are the Sign, *&c.*) And ſo there is no Sacrament.

Ib. Yes, ſays the *Repreſenter:* The *Euchariſt is a Figure or Repreſentation of the Death of Chriſt. Anſ.* True, where Bread and Wine are in the Euchariſt: But in an Euchariſt with Tranſubſtantiation, there can be

be no Figure or Repreſentation of the Death of Chriſt, For the Body of Chriſt it ſelf cannot now be broken, nor his real Bloud powred out and ſeparated from his Body, to make a Repreſentation of his Death; and there is no Subſtance beſides remaining to be broken and powred out, ſuppoſing Tranſubſtantiation, and yet there muſt be ſome real thing broken and powred out to be a Repreſentation of his Death: Therefore in their way, there is no Repreſentation of his Death.

But, ſays the *Repreſenter, The outward and viſible ſpecies of Bread, are a Sign of the Heavenly Bread that is within.* Ib.

Anſw. I thought whether he would come at laſt, though it was long before he brought it out. He has given us a good Rule in the ſame Page: *See firſt to underſtand the Doctrine of your Adverſaries before you confute it.* And I believe our ordinary Proteſtants ſcarce indeed underſtand, what *ſpecies of Bread* means. The *Trent Catethiſm* * will help us out, when it makes this to be the third wonderful thing effected by the words of Conſecration: That *Accidents which are ſeen, or perceived by our other Senſes, are without any thing for their Subject* in which they are, *by a certain wonderful and inexplicable manner.* The Myſtery of which is this; that there is whiteneſs there without any thing white; roundneſs, without any thing round; heavineſs, without any thing heavy; taſtfulneſs, without any thing to be taſted, *&c.* So that if you ſhould ask the *Repreſenter*, what thing is that which in the receiving of the Euchariſt he perceives to be white, round, heavy or taſtful; he would be at a full ſtop, and cannot name you any thing that is ſo. I am ſure he dare not *now* name the Body of Chriſt for that thing, (and there is not any thing there beſides that, and the Accidents) though * Cathec. ad paroc.

though perhaps in *Berengarius's* time, the queſtion might have been more eaſily reſolved, in reference to ſome of the Accidents I named, when he was made by P. *Nicholas* II. in his Recantation to aſſert, that the Bleſſed Body of Chriſt was [*Senſualiter*] ſenſibly *and in truth handled by the hands of the Prieſts and* broken, and ground by the Teeth of the Faithful, as it is ſet down by *Lanfrank* and others.

And now if the *Repreſenter* has nothing to ſhew us for a *Sign* in the Sacrament, beſides the *ſpecies of Bread*; though he or his Church may invent what Signs they pleaſe, yet I am ſure, this is none of *Chriſts Signs* in his Inſtitution of it; for that which he took and Bleſſed, and brake, and gave to his Diſciples, was *Bread* and the *Fruit of the Vine.* And I am alſo aſſured by the Writings of the *Fathers*, that they knew of no ſuch Sign, as *Species* or Accidents of Bread and Wine without a Subject: Let him name me but one that has plainly taught it, and I will give him twenty Inſtances where they expreſs themſelves quite contrary; and all that has been brought out of them before, concerning Bread and Wine, being the Sign and Symbol of Chriſts Body and Bloud, even after Conſecration, is a confutation of *his Sign*; for the *Species of Bread*, is not *Bread.*

Ib. But the *Repreſenter* proceeds, *It does not deny it to be a Remembrance or Commemoration for whoſoever receives it, according to St.* Paul, *ſhews forth the Paſſion and Death of our Redeemer. It does not deny it to Operate by a Vertue, for it has Vertue and Power there to work in the Soul.*

Anſw. There may be many ways indeed, to remember Chriſt and his Paſſion; but the Queſtion here is, Whether in the way of your Church, there is a Commemoration of Chriſt, *as in a Sacrament?* And whether

ther the Fathers look upon Chriſt there as you do. St. *Auſtin* * ſpeaking of the Fleſh and Bloud of Chriſt, He conſiders it three ways, as promiſed before his coming in Sacrifices of things that were Types of it; as it was exhibited in the Truth it ſelf at the time of his Paſſion; and (which is to our purpoſe) *as celebrated by the Sacrament of its Remembrance*, (per Sacramentum memoriæ) *after his Aſcenſion.* This Aſcenſion ſuppoſes his Body not here, but gone from us, where it is to be (as the Scripture tells us) *till the time of the Reſtitution of all things*; and St. *Paul* tells us, that by what we do in the Sacrament, in eating that Bread and drinking that Cup which he recommended, we *annunciate the Lords Death till he come.*

* Cont. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 21.

And the Fathers make this Remembrance, to be a certain Argument of his abſence from us, (*i. e.* with reſpect to his natural Body,) ſo that St. *Auſtin*, as well as others, lays it down as a Rule, † *Nemo recordatur niſi quod in præſentia non eſt poſitum, That onely a man remembers which is not preſent before him. Gaudentius* ‖ calls the Sacrament an *Hereditary gift of the New Teſtiment which Chriſt left as a Pledge of his preſence*; and ſays, *This is our Viaticum, Proviſion for our Journey, by which we are nouriſhed, till we go to him out of this World.* And *Primaſius* * compares it to a *Pledge, which when one is dying, he leaves to him whom he loved*; to look upon this Pledge, and affectionately to remember him by it. And *Sedulius* (upon the ſame place) has all the very ſame Words. We have alſo ſeen before, how the Fathers tell us, we ſhall have no need of theſe Symbols, when the Body it ſelf appears, and is preſent.

† In Pſal. 37.

‖ Tract. 2. in Exod.

* In 1 Cor. c. 11.

Is it not very apparent then, that the Church of *Rome* by bringing into the Sacrament, ſuch a preſence of Chriſts natural Body, which makes thoſe Signs and Pledges of

his dying Love to ceaſe, and no longer to exiſt; has deſtroyed that way of remembring him which he himſelf appointed?

As for the *Vertue and Power* which he ſays it has *to work in the Soul*; ſince he has not told us of any of its effects in particular, I queſtion whether he can name any; though we ſhould be glad to hear what they are, and how produced, eſpecially what Vertue they believe it has on wicked Men, who by receiving the Euchariſt, according to them, have a ſubſtantial preſence of Chriſts Body and Soul and Divinity within them. It did not prevent, in the Caſe of *Judas*, the Devils entring into him: and if we conſult the Hiſtory of the Ages, when Tranſubſtantiation was firſt made an Article of Faith; we hear preſently of Cruſado's againſt Hereticks, and of a ſtrange Zeal inſpiring their St. *Dominick*, to make havock of thoſe for whom Chriſt died, but ſhall find leſs of that meek and gentle Spirit of our Saviour reſting upon men, and reſiding in them, than ever before.

After the *Repreſenter* has told us what they own; He goes on to acquaint us with *what they deny and condemn.*

Ib. *What our Church denys and condemns, is, that the Body and Bloud of Chriſt is there onely, as in a Sign or in a Figure, or a Vertue, and not according to the verity and ſubſtance of it.*

Anſw. Here he has repreſented things by halves. His Church denys and condemns not onely this, but a great deal more, (as we heard at the beginning out of the Trent Council.) Does not he know that the Proteſtants of the *Ausburg Confeſſion*, deny and condemn what he here has ſet down? and yet there are Anathema's againſt them. So it condemns thoſe *that affirm that there remains the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, and deny the Converſion of the whole ſubſtance of them into the Body and Bloud*

Blood of Christ, and that the ſpecies of them onely remain. It condemns thoſe with an Anathema that *deny, that in the Euchariſt under either ſpecies or every ſingle part of each ſpecies whole Chriſt is contained.*

What your Church condemns, I have proved that the *Fathers* aſſerted, (to inſtance in this, of the Bread and Wine remaining,) that they aſſert this onely to be the Sign and the Figure which Chriſt Inſtituted, and knew nothing of your Sign of Species and Accidents without a Subject, is, what I have all along ſhown. And if this be proving nothing againſt you, it's ſtrange, when you deny what they have ſo plainly affirmed.

And what a rediculous thing is it, to call upon us ſo often, to *ſhew that the Fathers maintain the Sacrament to be onely a Sign, and onely a Figure,* &c. when we ſhow that which is far more *contrary to your Belief*, that *They* are for quite *another Sign and Figure,* which you condemn; and that *your Sign and Figure* is *none at all.* Their Sign is as much different from yours, (to uſe *Tertullians* compariſon) as a Helmet or a Vizard differs from a man.

I do not blame the *Repreſenter*, therefore, that he next endeavours to avoid the charge of *Novelty*. But its a pretty odd way he takes herein. *'Tis aſſerted poſitively by* Bellarmine, *and it has been the conſtant Doctrine of our Divines.* If the charge of *Novelty* be in reſpect to what the *Fathers* held, both what *Bellarmine* and your Divines aſſert, may be liable to it, for they all advance Poſitions which the Fathers never thought of. But there is a *Novelty in Popery*, (I mean that which the *Repreſenter* and *Monſieur de Meaux* have introduced in their Expoſitions) which even *Bellarmine* and the *Divines* were ſtrangers to, and have poſitively aſſerted the contrary; The *Repreſenter* would do well

to take off that charge, which has been laid home to them lately, in particular inſtances, but not a ſyllable of Anſwer has been returned thereto.

That which follows in the *Repreſenter*, (and is the hardeſt task he has met with) *about the nature and ſubſtance of Bread remaining after Conſecration*; He ſhuffles it off, as his manner is, with trifling Amuſements, and general Stories thus. *As for what ſome of the Fathers mention* (we add, *and all of them ſuppoſe*) *of the nature or ſubſtance of Bread remaining, any one vers'd in their Writings is not ignorant, that by theſe terms they often mean no more than the natural Qualities and viſible Appearances of things, as you your ſelves can tell us upon occaſion, when it ſerves your turn to have it ſo.*

Anſw. I wiſh he could truly ſay, what we can, That the onely turn we have to ſerve, is Truth. When we interpret the word *Nature* or *Subſtance* in ſome places of the Fathers, of *Natural* or *Accidental Qualities*; it is only when they cannot otherwiſe be fairly reconciled to themſelves, or to thoſe Truths they all hold in common, without differing one from another in Senſe, though their Expreſſions may differ about them. Neither are we ſo abſurd at any time as to make *Subſtance* and *Nature*, to ſignifie the Repreſenters *Viſible Appearances*, or *Species without a Subject*, which can no more be reconciled to *Fathers*, than to *common Senſe*. But now if he had done any thing, he ſhould have tryed to apply his *Viſible Appearances*, and Natural Qualities to the particular places that have been produced out of St. *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, and *Gelaſius*, and have ſhown us how well this Senſe accords with the Argument they are managing againſt Hereticks, and with that *Medium* they bring from the Euchariſt to confute them; but when ever he ſhall attempt this, we ſhall find him turn

their

their Arguments againſt themſelves, which will be a pretty way of ſhewing their meaning.

As for his next Evaſion; *That thoſe Expreſſions of the Fathers are onely occaſional and accidental, but when they treat profeſſedly of this ſubject, they ſpeak plainly in our behalf*, &c. Ibid.

Anſw. Theſe we look upon as words of courſe, when he muſt ſay ſomething, but has nothing to ſay to the purpoſe. The Reader who has ſeen what Teſtimonies both of us have produced, if he be impartial, muſt needs acknowledge that this is a confident aſſertion, without any ſhadow of Truth; ſo far from it, that the more deſignedly and largely they treat of this matter, as (to inſtance in the three laſt Fathers I named) when they do not onely glance at the Sacrament in a haſty paſſage to another ſubject, but profeſſedly make choice of the Euchariſt, to explain another thing in diſpute by, and bring an Argument from thence of what all ſides confeſs concerning it, to prove that other thing denied, where if they cannot make the Parallels run exactly, (as in the caſe of the two Natures in Chriſt) they expoſe themſelves onely to their Adverſaries, and prove nothing; yet even there, I ſay, they declare themſelves moſt fully to agree with our ſenſe, and quite oppoſitely to that which they of the Roman Communion believe.

If this be not enough to anſwer this Pretence, take but this further inſtance, and it will effectually do it; it is St. *Auſtin's*, of interpreting Scripture and figurative Speeches: and let the *Repreſenter* conſider whether ever any man ſpeaks leſs occaſionally and accidentally, than when he lays down profeſſedly a *Rule* for interpreting a matter. So St. *Auſtin* does, and gives an example of his Rule *, in this manner: *If the ſpeech be by way of command, either forbidding a crime or wicked thing*,

* De Doctr. Chriſt. lib. 3. cap. 16.

thing, or bidding a beneficial good thing to be done, it is not a figurative ſpeech; but if it ſeems to command a crime or wicked action, it is figurative. And then he gives the example of his Rule, in thoſe words of Chriſt: *Except ye eat the fleſh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you. Now this,* ſays he, *ſeems to command a crime or horrid thing, therefore it is a Figure, commanding us to communicate in the Paſſion of our Lord, and ſweetly and profitably to treaſure up in our memory, that his Fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.* Let the *Repreſenter* try with all his skill, to reconcile this to the Doctrine of *his Church*, ſince we cannot deviſe how he ſhould *ſpeak more plainly in our behalf.*

P. 24. What the *Repreſenter* ſays of *dubious and obſcure Expreſſions in all Books*, makes nothing for him, nor againſt us, unleſs he had ſhewn in particular inſtances, that the Teſtimonies we cite out of the Fathers, are ſuch: I rather am apt to think they are plainer than he would have them to be. But I have ſhewn before, that the Expreſſions *they* cite out of them are commonly *Rhetorical Figures* and *Elegancies*, *Hyperboles*, and *Proſopopœa's*, which in the nature of them, cannot have ſo determinate a ſignification. But I have a worſe objection againſt them than that of *dubious Expreſſions in Books*, that the *Books themſelves* which they cite, are often very *dubious*; that the *Homilies* of the Fathers (wherein they trade much) are often *vagrant Homilies*, being ſometimes affixt to one Father, ſometimes to another, and hard to know at laſt to whom they belong; and that they give us *Latin Verſions* (as *Voſſius Tungrenſis* does of *Ephrem Syrus*) out of Greek Manuſcripts, as is pretended, which we can never ſee nor compare with them.

Ibid. He might alſo have better let alone his inſtance of ſuch *dubious and obſcure Expreſſions* in the Bible (but that

that he ſeems to have taken an occaſion to have his Flurt at it) unleſs he had made a better choice, than that which he calls an *Occaſional Expreſſion* (no body knows why) *of St.* Paul, *Philip.* 2. *v.* 6, 7. For the phraſes he uſes of μορφὴ θεοῦ, ἰσότιμα θεῷ, and ἰσότης ἀνθρώπων, concerning Chriſt, give no more occaſion to any wiſe perſon to object, that he was no real and ſubſtantial man; than the μορφὴ δούλου, and ἐν ἴσα θεῷ, in the verſe before, that he was not really and in Nature God; that is, they neither of them *give an occaſion* to object either way; though perverſe Cavillers may *take occaſion to* object as much one way as the other, and have done ſo.

We are now come to the laſt proof of the *Repreſenter's* skill, the anſwering of a ſcurvy objection, which to the Worlds end will lie againſt Tranſubſtantiation; and that is, that it *contradicts the ſenſes of all mankind*; and puts a perpetual abuſe upon them; and that not onely in reſpect of thoſe ſenſes which require ſome remove and due diſtance from the Object that is to be examined by them, but of thoſe which are to be joyned neerly to it, ſuch as *touching and taſting*, which require onely a due diſpoſition of our Organs, to give true notices of things to our underſtandings.

You may gueſs how weighty his Anſwer is likely to be, by the childiſhneſs of its beginning, when he calls this our *Cock-Argument*, which very phraſe none but a *Trifler* would have uſed: and alſo by his contemptuous reflection upon that excellent *Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation*, which they having been never able yet to anſwer, no not to their own ſatisfaction, all that remains for them to do, is to treat it with ſcorn; juſt as the braving Hectors do, thoſe that have beaten and diſarm'd them. The *Repreſenter* has put it in the *Contents* at the beginning, *That a Papiſt believes his ſenſes in this myſtery as much as the Proteſtant*: here at the end he

he ſays to the *Proteſtant, I believe more of my ſenſes than you do*; that is, as he after ſays, I believe *one ſenſe more than you believe.* Is not this brave ſtrutting before an objection, that will always foil him whenever he copes with it? But how does he make out this Paradox? ſince we are ſure he is not turn'd Proteſtant; and he knows what we mean by this phraſe of *believing our ſenſes*: for he himſelf has explained it afterwards, by *framing a Judgment from the information of our Senſes*; which is the ſame we mean: for he ſpeaks of the Judgment of a *ſubſtance*, from what the Senſes inform us concerning its *Accidents*; and we do not pretend he knows (though he would inſinuate the contrary) that our ſenſes go *beyond the Accidents*, but that by the notices they give us of theſe, we know and are aſſured of the *bodily ſubſtances* of which they are *Accidents.* There being therefore no ambiguity of terms, is it not ſtrange that he ſhould believe his ſenſes as much and more than we do?

Ibid. His own words muſt make it out, or nothing, which are theſe: *My eyes tell me there is the colour of Bread, and I aſſent to them; my tongue that it has the taſt of Bread, I agree to it; my ſmelling that it has the ſmell of Bread, I yield to it; my fingers that it feels like Bread, I accept of the information.* Well then, ſince the information is accepted and not denied, and the judgment framed from the *information of the Senſes* (according to himſelf) is *believing the ſenſes*, the believing the ſenſes in this caſe muſt be what we believe, that *it is Bread.* Does he believe ſo? No. For his next words are theſe: *My ears tell me from the words ſpoken by Chriſt himſelf, that it is the Body of Chriſt; I believe theſe too: Is not here one ſenſe more than you believe?* I think not; for I hope we believe as much as he does the words that Chriſt ſpoke, *This is my Body:* But how *his Ears* can tell him, That *it is the Body of Chriſt, from the words ſpoken by Chriſt,* unleſs

unleſs his ears had heard Chriſt ſpeak the words, he can never tell us, it being a perfect Riddle; and he muſt be contented with the information his *Eyes onely* give him, by *reading in the Goſpel* the words which Chriſt ſpake, and *both of us* read them there: ſo that here is but the information of the four Senſes ſtill, which we believe; but now he has diſcarded the firſt three, by paſſing a judgment againſt their information, that no *ſubſtance of Bread* remains in the Sacrament. And he has nothing now left to inform him but his Eyes, concerning the *Body of Chriſt there*, which he believes: neither is it from his Eyes *perceiving colour*, that he is engaged to believe thus; for he acknowledges it is *the colour of Bread*, not of the Body of Chriſt, but from his Eyes *perceiving the Characters* of theſe written words, *This is my Body*. Now we reading theſe written words, and alſo what goes before and after theſe words, judge that both the *Bread* and alſo the *Body of Chriſt* is there: for the word [*This*] (remembring what Chriſt *took, bleſſed, brake*, and *gave* to his Diſciples, which was Bread) plainly points to *Bread*; the word [*is*] tells us what it is at preſent, not what it ſhall be turned into afterwards; and the words [*my Body*] how they are to be underſtood, lie indifferently between us. *He* may read his Eyes out, before he meets with [*My Natural Body*, or *Proper Body*;] for thoſe words are not there, which is *his* interpretation of *my Body*; but is deſtroyed by ſuppoſing the ſubſtance of Bread to be there: for they all acknowledge, that it's impoſſible that *Bread* taken properly, can be the *Body of Chriſt* taken properly. Therefore *our interpretation* can onely have place, that the Bread (ſo bleſſed and broken) is the *Symbolical* and *Repreſentative Body* of Chriſt crucified.

I have already ſpoiled his next Conceit, which is perfectly *new* to me, having never met with it any-where elſe, *That the ſenſe by which Faith comes, is that of Hearing*; for which he cites St. *Paul*, poſitively affirming, that *Faith* Ibid.

comes by Hearing: and not being contented to make it *one of the Senſes* by which Faith comes, he takes it excluſively of all the reſt; for he adds, *That ſenſe by which all Faith is to be conveyed into my ſoul.*

That all this is impertinently urged, appears by what he urges it for, *viz.* to prove that he believes his Senſes, concerning the words of Chriſt, *This is my Body*; which I have ſhewn already neither *his Ears* nor *ours* are concerned in, but onely in the Writing that contains them. And S *Paul*'s words, that *Faith comes by Hearing*, is as impertinently applied: for S. *Paul* ſpeaks concerning the neceſſity of revelation of matters that concern the ſalvation of Jews and Gentiles, that we cannot come to the knowledge and belief of them, but by the preaching of thoſe whom God ſends to declare them, and mens hearkning and attending to what they declare: but our Queſtion is concerning giving credit to the report of our Senſes concerning a bodily ſubſtance, the preſence of *Bread* in the Sacrament.

But the worſt is, that all is falſe, when taken excluſively, as I have ſhewn he takes it; for even in reſpect of matters of pure revelation, it is not true that Faith comes only by the ſenſe of *Hearing*. Let one of the beſt of his own Interpreters be Judge in the caſe *, who upon that place, *How ſhall they believe on him of whom they have not heard?* has theſe words: *Under hearing is comprehended reading, which is performed by ſeeing: for as very many by hearing, ſo many alſo by ſeeing, have believed; for the Goſpels were written, that they that read them might believe*, according to S. *John*, c. 20. v. 31. What does the *Repreſenter* think of Chriſt's words to the Diſciples (*Luk.* 24. 39.) when he would convince them that he had a true Body, and was not an Apparition; does not he appeal to other Senſes, when he ſays, *Handle me and ſee, for a ſpirit has not fleſh and bones*, &c. And when our Saviour bad S. *Thomas* not to be *faithleſs*, but *believing*, did he onely ſpeak to him that his Faith might come by hearing?

* Eſtius in Rom. 10. 14.

No,

No, he appeals to other Senſes: *Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thruſt it into my ſide,* Joh 20.27. And *v.*29. he ſays to him, *Becauſe thou haſt ſeen, thou haſt believed.* But I am almoſt aſhamed, to have ſaid ſo much, to confute ſo weak a Pretence.

His laſt Pretence has the very ſame fault with the former, that it is nothing to the purpoſe: he ſays, *When a Revelation intervenes, I chuſe rather to judge from this, than from my ſenſes. Anſ.* So will we too, when the thing to be judged, is a proper object of our ſenſes; and when God tells us that we are not to truſt them, becauſe he intends to repreſent things otherwiſe than they are to them, which is in effect to deceive them. But he begs the Queſtion, when he would make us believe that there is any ſuch Revelation, that there is *no Bread in the Euchariſt*, and that therefore we are not to *believe our ſenſes* in this matter.

As for what he adds, That *Abraham did ſo, when being told by his ſenſes, that thoſe three that appeared to him* (Gen. 18.) *were men, and by a revelation from God, that they were Angels, judged of them and their nature according to the Revelation, and not according to his Senſes.* This is ſaid with equal skill to all the reſt. For it does not appear by that Text, that he had any Revelation from God, when they appeared to him, that they were Angels, but rather that he judged according to his Senſes that they were men: for does the Water for their feet, and Butter, and Milk, and Cakes, and a Calf for their food, look like an intended Treat for Angels, or for Men? And he might alſo have thought of another Text, which ill agrees with what he ſays, *Heb.* 13.2. (and refers to *Abraham* among others) *that ſome have entertained Angels unawares.* For which, to ſpare further labour, I refer him to the fore-named *Eſtius* upon the place, where he will find his ſenſe fully and effectually confuted. But if what the *Repreſenter* ſays were true, it concludes nothing: for what though our Senſes are not proper Judges of immaterial and

ſpiritual

spiritual substances, and what appearances they may be under; yet (as the first learned Answer to him has heretofore told him *) when the *Question is, whether Bodies can be so present after the manner of Spirits, as to lose all the natural properties of Bodies, and a material substance lost under the Accidents proper to it*, it's to be hoped our Senses may be proper *Judges of the one* by the *other*.

* The Doctr. and Pract. of the Chur. of *Rome* represented truly, p. 52.

His Farewel concerning *April Errands to the Chappels, to see the nursing and rocking the Child in the Cradle*, I thought to have passed over, being glad to hear that *his Church* is in a fairer way to reform any thing heretofore amiss, (tho' his own light and childish temper, unfit to meddle with divine matters, will scarce allow such hopes concerning himself) yet lest it should be thought that such things are only stories of what was never practised, I'll give him the words of a learned Jesuit †, who was an eye-witness of something worse, who speaking of forty days between the Nativity and Purification, kept by some religiously, under the title of *Recubitus Mariæ* (*Nostre Dame in couche*) adds, ' *Ea* ' *specie vidimus ipsi in quodam apud* Canares *cœnobio fre-* ' *quentiam per totum illud tempus eo commeantium, præser-* ' *tim Mulierum, quasi religioso officio erga Virginem jacentem* ' (*uti erga puerperas post partum assolet*) *defungentium. Do-* ' *mina primaria Roxana Conjugis Alexandri Magni æquivo-* ' *ca, in eadem* Canarum *ora, in honorem Quadragenarii re-* ' *cubitus B. Virginis post puerperium totam illam Quadrige-* ' *nam----exigit in lectio recumbens ut puerpera, singulari planè* ' *& ad hanc diem incondita religione. Quid quod alicubi* ' *multa pulvinaria capiti decumbentis in puerperio Virginis* ' *supponi solita, picturas sibi in Templo visas Scribit* Molanus, ' *lib.* 2. de Imagin. *cap.* 27. &c. Which I leave for him to translate.

† Th. Raynold. Dyp. Marian. p. 89.

THE END.